

Duquesne University Duquesne Scholarship Collection

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Fall 1-1-2016

Eudaimonia: Utilizing Aristotle's Good Life to Inform Organizational Communication to Reimagine Human Resources Management

Matthew Anthony Fuss

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dsc.duq.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Fuss, M. (2016). Eudaimonia: Utilizing Aristotle's Good Life to Inform Organizational Communication to Reimagine Human Resources Management (Doctoral dissertation, Duquesne University). Retrieved from <https://dsc.duq.edu/etd/49>

This Worldwide Access is brought to you for free and open access by Duquesne Scholarship Collection. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Duquesne Scholarship Collection. For more information, please contact phillips@duq.edu.

EUDAIMONIA: UTILIZING ARISTOTLE'S GOOD LIFE TO INFORM
ORGANIZATIONAL COMMUNICATION TO REIMAGINE HUMAN
RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

A Dissertation

Submitted to the McAnulty College and Graduate School of Liberal Arts

Duquesne University

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

By

Matthew A. Fuss

December 2016

Copyright by
Matthew A. Fuss

2016

EUDAIMONIA: UTILIZING ARISTOTLE'S GOOD LIFE TO INFORM
ORGANIZATIONAL COMMUNICATION TO REIMAGINE HUMAN
RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

By

Matthew A. Fuss

Approved August 19, 2016

Dr. Richard H. Thames
Associate Professor of Communication
and Rhetorical Studies
(Committee Chair)

Dr. Janie H. Fritz
Professor of Communication and
Rhetorical Studies
(Committee Member)

Dr. Pat Arneson
Professor of Communication and
Rhetorical Studies
(Committee Member)

Dr. James Swindal
Professor and Dean, McNulty College
and Graduate School of Liberal Arts
Philosophy

Dr. Ronald C. Arnett
Professor and Chair, Department of
Communication and Rhetorical Studies

ABSTRACT

EUDAIMONIA: UTILIZING ARISTOTLE'S GOOD LIFE TO INFORM ORGANIZATIONAL COMMUNICATION TO REIMAGINE HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

By

Matthew A. Fuss

December 2016

Dissertation supervised by Dr. Richard H. Thames

The current study seeks to explore Aristotle's concept of *eudaimonia*, or the good life, as a means to inform organizational communication in order to reimagine human resource management. The project begins by laying bare the current paradigm of egoism/altruism as the inappropriately accepted method to interpret employer/employee relationships. Google is used as an example of a successful contemporary organization widely criticized for their profitability and exploitation of workers. A historical example, Robert Owens, of the 19th century social utopians is used to illustrate a successful enterprise widely lauded for their altruism and benevolence. If one judges Google by the criteria applied to Robert Owens and Robert Owens by the criteria applied to Google, it becomes clear that praise or blame is dependent solely on the bias of the critic. A paradigm of reciprocity (drawing upon Alastair McIntyre's critique of the

egoism/altruism dichotomy and Aristotle's understanding of the *polis*) is offered as an alternative to the modern, Hobbesian paradigm shown lacking. Aristotle's concept of *eudaimonia* is discussed and connections are made to organizational communication, specifically those done internally to create a culture or brand. I end with a discussion of what human resources according to Aristotle should look like, as well as implications for further study.

The project begins in chapter 1 by laying bare the current paradigm of egoism/altruism as the inappropriately accepted method to interpret relationships. Google is used as an example of a successful contemporary organization widely criticized for their profitability and exploitation of workers. A historical example, Robert Owens, of the 19th century social utopians is used to illustrate a successful enterprise widely lauded for their altruism and benevolence. If one judges Google by the criteria applied to Robert Owens and Robert Owens by the criteria applied to Google, it becomes clear that praise and blame are dependent solely on the bias of the critic.

Chapter 2 offers a different paradigm, reciprocity, as an alternative to the Hobbesian paradigm shown lacking. The Hobbesian paradigm in which relationships are essentially a competition with incompatible self-interests leading to a winner and a loser is an inaccurate, albeit a traditionally accepted philosophical underpinning for social critique. The unexamined assumption of the validity of the egoism/altruism dichotomy has led to an inherent bias on the part of the critics, and therefore needs to be replaced with the Aristotelian concept of reciprocity as the dominant paradigm for interactions between individuals.

Chapter 3 serves to provide some important context for the disciplines of human resource management, organizational culture and organizational communication. An exploration of the development of these disciplines serves as historical grounding. The emerging disciplines of professional civility and positive organizing are also discussed with strong connections made to the concept of reciprocity.

In chapter 4 Aristotle's concept of *eudaimonia* is discussed and connections are made to organizational communication, specifically those done internally to create a culture or brand. Allowing ourselves to be informed by Aristotle's concept of a "good life", businesses can better understand how to position themselves as an integral element of a person living said good life. In the *Nicomachean Ethics* (NE) Aristotle talks about what he calls the good life. The idea is that one engages in certain activities with the expressed purpose of attaining some good.

A discussion of what human resources according to Aristotle should look like, as well as implications for further study are dealt with in chapter 5. Suggestions on how human resources ought to be reimagined in light of Aristotelean principles are offered. I address how businesses need to be attentive not only to functional extrinsic rewards but also how business must focus on intrinsic rewards such as happiness in order to help motivate people to attain heights of excellence. Aristotle's ideas of the golden mean as well as distributional justice are used to inform the suggested reimagined human resource practices. A final connection is made to the concept of distributism as a perspective worthy of exploration as it connects to distribution of organizational resources.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this work to my Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, my wife and children and my family.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to acknowledge the incredible faculty and staff in the Department of Communication and Rhetoric Studies for their guidance, patience and encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Abstract	iv
Chapter 1: Misappropriation of the Hobbesian View of Man	1
A Critique of Google	1
Google's Praises	6
In Praise of Social Utopians and Robert Owen	7
Reversing the Critiques	11
Not All Bad, Not All Good	19
Chapter 2: Reciprocity as the New Paradigm	21
The Traditional View of Hobbes	22
A Contrary View Provided by MacIntyre	28
Strong Reciprocity	29
Aristotle and the Polis	32
Human Nature	38
Money and Work enter the Equation	41
Interpersonal Communication Perspectives	43
Reciprocity	49
Chapter 3: Context and Historical Grounding	51
Human Resource Management	51
Organizational Culture	61
Organizational Communication	71
Additional Perspectives	85

Chapter 4: Aristotle and Eudaimonia	93
Differing Interpretations of the Most Final End	96
Differing Perspectives on Arriving at Eudaimonia	100
Aristotelean Human Resource Management	104
Brand as a Means to Eudaimonia	114
Chapter 5: Aristotle as Chief Human Resource Officer	116
Economy and the Polis	122
Reimagining Human Resource Practices	135
Aristotelean Workplace	139
Summary	147
References	150

CHAPTER ONE

Misappropriation of the Hobbesian View of Man

The project begins by laying bare the current paradigm of egoism/altruism as the inappropriately accepted method to interpret relationships. Google is used as an example of a successful contemporary organization widely criticized for their profitability and exploitation of workers. A historical example, Robert Owens, of the 19th century social utopians is used to illustrate a successful enterprise widely lauded for their altruism and benevolence. The criteria for criticism is then reversed to illustrate how Google could be praised while Owen could be reviled. If one judges Google by the criteria applied to Robert Owens and Robert Owens by the criteria applied to Google, it becomes clear that praise and blame are dependent solely on the bias of the critic. The section ends with a discussion which serves to clarify the fact that both Google and Owen are not only good or bad, but are good and bad.

A Critique of Google

The history and rise to prominence of Google is well documented and not something I will spend time unpacking in detail. To summarize, Google founders Sergey Brin and Larry Page met at Stanford in 1995. They began collaborating on a search engine within a year and registered Google as a domain name in 1997. The company filed for incorporation in California, began operating out of a garage in Menlo Park and hired their first employee in 1998. The company continued to grow in size and product offerings until their initial public offering in 2004. Since that time Google has continued to grow dramatically and has established itself as the premier internet search engine.

Google is routinely criticized for its cult-like culture which purportedly leads to its exploitation of workers, and its perceived monopolistic practices. Google's human resource

Eudaimonia: Using Aristotle to Inform Organizational Communication in Order to Reimagine Human Resource Management

practices, particularly its hiring practices are a point of contention. The company hires only the types of people which “fit” into its carefully created culture, thus perpetuating the cultish axiom that one must be a Googler to become a Googler. In an effort to hire only those who will fit into the Google culture, an algorithm was created by People Operations Vice President Laszlo Bock and his team to accurately predict which candidate has the highest probability of success once hired. According to Bock, as Google got bigger, it became harder and harder to find enough people and they became worried that traditional hiring methods would overlook some of the best candidates (Hansell, 2007). Bock’s team looked at the entire hiring process and determined that little value was added after four interviews, leading to a dramatic shortening of time to hire. All hiring decisions are made by a group to eliminate individual bias or self-serving decisions. Two key quotes from the team highlight its goals: “All people decisions at Google are based on data and analytics” and the goal is to ... “bring the same level of rigor to people-decisions that we do to engineering decisions” (Sullivan, 2013). Looking at Google’s human resource practices, or as they refer to them, “people operations”, it becomes clear that from early the company was determined to be different. Early in its history, Google instituted a “20 percent rule”, meaning that employees are permitted and encouraged to devote one day per week to a project of their choosing, as opposed to something assigned by a manager or boss. In practice it often became one day a week in addition to a full week’s work, but people loved and participated in the program widely and even used this time to come up with actual products like Google News. Starting as Google did working out of a house, Sergey Brin and Larry Page realized that amenities like showers, food and having a washer and drier around are extremely important to attracting new college graduates. One of the highlights of each week is the all-hands meeting commonly called TGIF, which happens at 4:30 on Fridays. The meeting is a classic example of

Eudaimonia: Using Aristotle to Inform Organizational Communication in Order to Reimagine Human Resource Management

solid employee relations strategy. The founders, in effect, hold a staff meeting to disseminate information, introduce new employees (called Nooglers), demonstrate new company products and finally hold an open question and answer time. Although just good common sense, this meeting serves to keep employees engaged, motivated and feeling like they have a voice, all important human resource tenets. Levy quotes Eric Schmidt talking about how some employees actually tried to devise a plan to live on the Google campus, “But the fact of the matter is that for some people living here makes sense. Their friends are here, it’s what they’re familiar with, and the things they do here are very similar to what they did in college” (p. 136). Google also goes to great lengths to provide ideal conditions for their employees to actually do their work, from an abundance of completely outfitted conference rooms, to “tech stops” ubiquitously located throughout every building allowing employees in need of basic technical assistance to just walk in and get their issue solved, to a streamlined expense report system resulting from employee complaints about the old system. Google makes every effort to eliminate obstacles to productivity and creativity and thus to free their employees up to do their job.

If viewed from the traditional Hobbesian perspective, Google is not acting out of altruism, rather it is providing benefits and perks in order to extract as much efficiency and productivity from their fabled workforce. According to McIntyre (1967), altruistic behavior for Hobbes is in our immediate self-interest as a means of preserving ourselves from the war of all against all. Under this perspective, Google is doing whatever it deems necessary to lessen its struggles in the arena of talent acquisition and retention, thus saving them time and money.

Marx makes the critique of Google a bit more clear.

Marx's concept of surplus value, exploitation and alienation lend texture to the idea of Google's making a profit being the result of an exploited work force. The essential insight, on which is based the whole of Marxian movement, is that the workers are exploited in that a part of what is produced is made available for others than workers to consume (Lerner, p. 50).

According to Marx capitalism is based on exploitation which is underpinned by the premise that the value of a product is equal to the amount of labor it takes to produce it. Marx would see the following syllogism as sound; 1) The value of a product (price) is determined by the amount of labor; 2) Workers receive the full value of what they contribute to the product; 3) Therefore, the value of a product equals the amount workers receive. If this is true, there can be no profits unless the workers are exploited. The owner sells the products for more than the value of the workers contribution, thereby exploiting them. Profit comes from paying workers less than the value they produce. Marx calls this surplus value and describes it as loot robbed from the laborer (Buchholz, p. 131). The capitalist can boost profits if he squeezes a longer work day out of his employees or by employing women and children [who earn less] (Buchholz, pp. 132-133). The misery of the proletariat is exasperated as capitalism runs its course resulting in longer working hours and less vacation, bringing more exploitation and misery to the downtrodden laborers. Buchholz (2007) quotes Marx, "with the constantly diminishing number of magnates of capital, who usurp and monopolize all advantage... grows the mass of misery, oppression, slavery, degradation and exploitation" (p. 135)

As we look at how this fits our discussion of Google, a distinction should be made between exploitation and surplus. Surplus is that part of the product remaining over and above what is necessary to "produce and reproduce" labor. Exploitation is that part of the product

remaining over and above what is received by labor. The two concepts become identical only by virtue of the silent assumption that labor receives only its “value” which is the minimum of subsistence (Lerner, p. 50). In everyday parlance, “to exploit” has either the neutral meaning “to use” or the emotionally charged meaning of obtaining unwarranted (unjust) advantage at the expense of something or someone. Marx himself offers the following clarification: “Holbach depicted all reality of individuals in their intercourse, e.g., speech, love, etc., in the form of the relationship of utility and use... In the given instance, utility has a very definite meaning, specifically, that I extract benefit by working to the detriment of someone else (*exploitation de l’homme par l’homme*)... [For the bourgeois] only one relationship has self-sufficing significance: the relationship of exploitation.” The view of market exploitation as the nonequivalent exchange of flows of labor was basic to his approach. The exploiter receives at his disposal goods that embody more working time that he personally invested in production, the exploited receives less (Kapeliushnikov, p. 28). Exploitation in the Marxist sense means that the total labor inputs necessary for a worker to be able to work for one hour must be less than one hour in duration.

The idea that exploitation serves as the source of profit and explains the functional mechanism of the capitalist economy has been formally expressed on the so-called “fundamental Marxist theorem.” It states that profit in a capitalist economy is positive when and only when there is exploitation of labor power (Kapeliushnikov, p. 32). Marx’s diatribe against exploitation and his characterization of it as plunder, thievery, parasitism, and even vampirism suggest that he himself unquestionably instilled ethical content in this concept. His rants make sense only when they relate to a morally unacceptable phenomenon that violates the justice principal. Exploitation is subject to moral condemnation both in itself, because it represents the

uncompensated appropriation of the labor of other, and because it is closely connected with relations of dominance and subordination, the alienation of labor, and inequity in the distribution of ownership of the means of production. Exploitation is depicted by Marx as the one-sided movement of value: hired workers “give up” the surplus product without getting anything in return. The absence of mutual advantage, of reciprocity, does not mean that a transaction does not have the right to exist (Kapeliushnikov, p. 33). According to Kapeliushnikov’s (1993) read of Marx, exploitation destroys the autonomy of the personality of the hired worker and destroys his dignity (p. 34), and leads to the uneven distribution of the burden of alienation of labor. “Alienation” in the given context means that the product is produced not for the sake of consumption (one’s own or that of people with whom one is connected by some personal relations), but for exchange, calculated in terms of some anonymous consumer. The degree of alienation is higher among those who are exploited (p. 36). Exploitation, according to Marx, expressed the character of dominant property relations, it is rooted in unequal access to the means of production. Since the capitalist controls the means of production the laborer has no choice but to labor for the capitalist who exploits him by seizing the surplus value added to the materials by labor. Cheshkov (1993) points out the following five themes of the Marxist theory of exploitation: 1). the cause of exploitation in inequality in relation to the means of production; 2). the source of exploitation is the capacity of the free wage laborer for labor; 3). exploitation is the source of capitalistic profit; 4). exploitation is the source of social wealth and the motor behind development; 5). exploitation causes social polarization and the class-antagonistic character of social relations (pp. 62-63).

Google's Praises

Google famously makes all their people operations decisions based on the same science it uses for other, more quantitative operations. Although people operations decisions are done to ensure a positive outcome, attraction, motivation and retention of the best people, one should not assume an altruistic motive. Google's market success can be attributed to what can only be labeled as extraordinary people management practices that result from its use of people analytics. A strategic focus on people management is necessary because innovations come from people, and you simply can't maximize innovations unless you are capable of recruiting and retaining innovators (Sullivan, 2013). According to Sullivan (2013) the basic premise of the "people analytics" approach is that accurate people management decisions are the most important and impactful decisions that a firm can make. You simply can't produce superior business results unless your managers are making accurate people management decisions. People costs often approach 60% of corporate variable costs, so it makes sense to manage such a large cost item analytically.

In Praise of Social Utopians and Robert Owen

Exploring the concept espoused by Google's "do no evil" motto, one is able to make connections to the ideas and philosophies put forth by the Utopian Socialists of the late 1700's and early 1800's. Utopian socialism was a movement borne out of the frustration of British and European laborers in factories where working conditions were deplorable at best and inhumane at worst. It was at this time that advancements in machinery were beginning to emerge further devaluing the laborers. Robert Heilbroner (1999) described factory owners of the time as harsh and cruel, rationalizing their cruelty under the guise of economic law. Adding to the frustration of workers was the fact that they were increasingly being replaced by machinery, "the

displacement of laboring hands by uncomplaining steel” (p. 106). According to Heilbroner (1999), in the wake of Adam Smith and David Ricardo, economic laws were thought to run the world and “were nothing [with] which one could or should trifle; they were simply there, and to rail about whatever injustices might be tossed up as unfortunate consequences of their working was as foolish as to lament the ebb and flow of the tides” (p. 124).

Out of this quagmire arose a cadre of Utopian Socialists including Robert Owen, Count Henri de Rouvro de Saint-Simon, Charles Fourier and J.S. Mill. I focus my attention on Owen, the son of an obscure Welsh trader. Owen at the age of nineteen was in complete charge of one of the larger spinning mills in Manchester, and before he reached his thirties the head of the largest, and what was soon to be acknowledged as the best equipped and best run, group of cotton mills in the country. For twenty-five years his capabilities and his philanthropies as a businessman were renowned throughout Great Britain, and his fame as an educator had attracted international attention. He was perhaps the most influential figure in the mid-nineteenth century trade-union movement. He was amongst the first to attempt the experiment of the ideal communist community. "Owenism" as a political concept has secured a permanent place in the terminology of the historian of socialism (Gorb, 1951). The social disorganization resulting from the Industrial Revolution caused much public concern at the time. The comfortable arguments of laissez-faire economics, with their implications of the laziness and moral irresponsibility of the poor, were those which were most commonly accepted amongst the manufacturing and business classes to explain this disorganization. According to Gorb (1951), much of the business classes wide acceptance of the doctrines of Malthus (whose *Essay on the Principle of Population* had recently been published) was owing to the fact that Malthus shifted the responsibility for the state of society to an area which was outside their control (p. 136).

Eudaimonia: Using Aristotle to Inform Organizational Communication in Order to Reimagine Human Resource Management

Gorb (1951) points out that Owen's argument was that the existing social order, which had grown up around the factory system, was responsible for the physical and social deterioration of the people who were living within it, and that the manufacturing and business classes had it in their power to profoundly influence that social order. Simply stated, Owen believed that mankind was profoundly influenced by its environment (p. 136). Hatcher (2013) points out that Owen's works and ideas predate modern human resource development (HRD) practices by almost two centuries, yet many of the tenets of contemporary HRD mirror his approaches to worker education, worker relations, social justice, and responsible leadership. He reduced working hours, introduced factory on-site educational programs, developed a cooperative learning community, and viewed work as a means for character building and social reform, all while building financially successful firms within an uncertain economy and a changing society (p. 415).

Heilbroner (1999) describes Owen as "the benevolent Mr. Owen of New Landmark" as a way to bring to the fore the many contrasts and contradictions lived out by this man--"a strange mixture of practicality and naiveté, achievement and fiasco, common sense and lunacy. A man who advocated the abandonment of the plow in favor of the spade; a man who from scratch became a great capitalist and from a great capitalist to a violent opponent of private property; a man who advocated benevolence because it would pay dividends, and who then urged the abolition of money" (p.109). Owen was influenced by Fourier's concept of the phalanxes, self-contained co-operative units of people who will live upon their own produce and trade surplus goods with neighboring phalanxes. The idea was that man, who is essentially good, might escape the foul environment which alone makes him bad. According to Holloway (1966), Owen came to America and announced, "I am come to introduce an entire new system of society; to

Eudaimonia: Using Aristotle to Inform Organizational Communication in Order to Reimagine Human Resource Management

change it from an ignorant, selfish system to an enlightened social system which shall gradually unite all interests into one, and remove all causes for contest between individuals” (p.104). Cole (1930) points out how, “The great inventions of the late eighteenth century – Watt’s steam engine, the [Hargreaves] spinning jenny, the [Arkwright] waterframe, and the [Crompton] mule – were enabling the industry to swell to a huge size in a very short time” (p. 16). Podmore (1907) noted that between 1780 and 1790 the population of Manchester doubled. Owen benefitted from this growth. His success as a businessman grew exponentially. But it was the rapid decline in living and working conditions of workers, their families, and especially children, that captured Owen’s attention and concerns. As a successful cotton spinner and “public celebrity” of some limited note, Owen was invited in 1793 to join a group of intellectuals with “like-minded” concerns about social conditions: the distinguished “manifestation of the Enlightenment”, the Manchester Literary and Philosophical Society. The young Owen was immediately inspired by a unique mix of moral philosophy, scientific theory and concerns with societal transformation (Hatcher, 2013). Podmore (1907) comments that Owen’s association with the Society changed his world views and served as a basis for his decision later in life, going so far as to say that his [Owen’s] friendship with Society founder Dr. Thomas Percival “determined the bent of his whole future life and work” (p. 60). Hatcher (2013) believes that philosophers William Godwin and Jeremy Bentham had significant sway over the development of Owen’s ideals. Owen undoubtedly read William Godwin’s *Political Justice* (Godwin, 1793), which outlined a new social order of equity and justice. The famous philosopher and social reformer Jeremy Bentham was a partner in New Lanark. Historians believe that his [Bentham’s] “greatest happiness of the greatest number” utilitarianism influenced Owen’s concerns for the social problems of the factory system and public education (p. 419). New Lanark was “then one

of the largest enterprises of its kind in the world” (Donnachie, 2000, p. 97) with over 1,200 workers. From 1800 until 1827, when he sold the firm, New Lanark was a factory dedicated to work reforms and social betterment through what Owen called a “new view of work and community” while simultaneously enhancing productivity, efficiency and profit (Owen, 1816).

Reversing the Critiques

Historically Owen is judged on his altruistic intentions and was prescribed the moniker of Benevolent from the same. If looked at from the perspective of his wealth and success, one could make an argument that Owens should be criticized for exploitation of his workers.

Owen as exploitative.

If the same criteria for criticism are applied to Google are applied to Owen, the results would be the same. Like most visionaries, Robert Owen was not without his detractors. Several of his contemporaries saw him as an unrealistic utopian, an elitist, a “buffoon”, an authoritarian with anti-democratic tendencies (Thompson, 1969), an impractical social visionary (Taylor, 1995), and a despot trying to control society and workers through benevolent paternalism (Hatcher, 2013). One thing is for sure, Owen was fabulously wealthy from his business ventures in England and had a grand reputation, even gaining audience with President of the United States when arriving for his first visit to America. Heilbroner (1999) points this out; “For the business minded gentlemen who were less likely to be carried away by the sight of happy children than the tenderhearted ladies, there was the irrefutable fact that that New Lanark was profitable, marvelously profitable. This was an establishment run not only by a saint but by an eminently practical one, at that” (p. 108). Heilbroner (1999) describes Owen’s rise through the textile manufacturing community as meteoric. In his mid-twenties Owens borrows money to purchase some failing textile factories in a squalid village named New Lanark. Within the span of only 10

years New Lanark rose to become world famous. According to Heilbroner, “in addition to winning a European reputation for farsightedness and benevolence, Robert Owen had made a fortune of at least 60,000 pounds sterling for himself” [operating factories at New Lanark] (p. 110). Halloway (1966), when talking about the similarities and differences of Fourier and Owen, points out that “a difference of a fortune existed; Owen had gained wealth and a European reputation from his reforms at New Lanark and could afford to finance his own schemes and reckon on respectful attention to them from influential persons”, while Fourier waited on his sympathetic millionaire (p. 104). Cole (1930) puts it this way, Owen established New Lanark “not merely a success as a [for profit] factory, but the laboratory for a great series of social experiments in education and moral and physical reform” (p. 69) and as an experiment in linking financial success with workplace reforms. Harrison (1969) goes so far as to state, the whole operation [New Lanark] could never be mistaken for anything other than what it was: a profit-making cotton mill (p. 155).

Gorb (1951) cites a portion of Owen’s own words in his address to the Superintendents of Manufactories in 1816, “Will you not afford some of your attention to consider whether a portion of your time and capital would not be more advantageously applied to improve your living machines? [. . .] I venture to assure you that your time and money so applied, if directed by a true knowledge of the subject, would return you not five, ten or fifteen percent, for your capital so expended, but often fifty and in many cases a hundred percent” (p. 137). Hatcher (2013) quotes Owen from his autobiography published in 1857, “My intentions were to commence a new system of management on principles of justice and kindness”, and admitted that his innovations were partly humanitarian and partly improved efficiency (p. 422).

Gorb (1951) also spoke about Owen and his financial success in terms of the various refinancings through which the New Lanark mills passed, “The original partnership lasted for ten years, at the end of which time, after paying 5 per cent per annum on the invested capital, the profits of the firm amounted to \$60,000. This presumably included the profits on the sale of the business to the new partnership, which bought the business for \$84,000, or \$24,000 more than had originally been paid to Dale [the original owner]. The first partnership had collapsed because of Owen's disagreement with his partners over his innovations. The second was to collapse only four years later for the same reasons. Owen, indeed, was forced to resign his position as mill manager, and he began to search for men and capital to reorganize once again. His partners, who were confident that he would be unable to obtain support, demanded a public auction in the hope of obtaining what was a very profitable enterprise at a cheap price. However, Owen was able to meet their bids and eventually bought the property for \$114,000. He states that after 5 per cent was paid for interest on the capital, the business had realized in the four years a profit of \$160,000 which also presumably includes the increase of \$30,000 on the purchase price” (p. 145). Owen was clearly making profits and able to reinvest considerable amounts of money to retain control of the factories at New Lanark. Podmore (1907) talked about Owen’s considerable wealth as a kind of contradiction, “It is interesting to trace the steps by which the prophet who preached a return to the land as the panacea for social evils, and pictured an ideal society in which there should be no more buying and selling, should come to be hailed as the founder of a huge trading concern, whose members reside in the large manufacturing town, and whose yearly turnover is counted by millions of pounds” (pp. 258-259).

At New Lanark all of Owen’s factories, which produced textiles, were operated by the inhabitants of his utopian community. Owen was undoubtedly successful and amassed great

wealth, all the while utilizing inhabitants of his communities to operate his factories. He gained wealth, very literally, on the backs of those he controlled.

Google as good.

One could make a compelling argument that Google should be praised for their progressive human resource policies and for being a great place to work. From the very beginning, founders Sergey Brin and Larry Page were deliberate about the kind of company they intended Google to be.

The influence of Maria Montessori.

Those ideas developed as a result of their experience with a Montessori-style education. Levy (2011) quotes Marissa Mayer, “You can’t understand Google, unless you know that both Larry and Sergey were Montessori kids” (p. 121). “Montessori” refers to schools based on the educational philosophy of Maria Montessori, an Italian physician born in 1870 who believed that children should be allowed the freedom to pursue what interested them. In Montessori schools children are encouraged to ask their own questions, do their own things. To disrespect authority. To do something because it makes sense, not because some authority figure told you (Levy, p. 122). According to “montessoriconnections.com”, a website devoted to educating people about the Montessori Method, it is a system of education that is both a philosophy of child development and a rationale for guiding such growth. It is based on two important developmental needs of children: the need for freedom within limits and a carefully prepared environment which guarantees exposure to materials and experiences. Through these developmental needs, the child develops intelligence as well as physical and psychological abilities. The Montessori Method of education is designed to take full advantage of the children’s desire to learn and their unique ability to develop their own capabilities. Children

need adults to expose them to the possibilities of their lives, but the children must determine their response to all the possibilities. The main premises of Montessori education are threefold: firstly, children are to be respected as different from adults and as individuals who differ from each other; secondly, children possess an unusual sensitivity and intellectual ability to absorb and learn from their environment that are unlike those of the adult both in quality and capacity and thirdly, the most important years of children's growth are the first six years of life when unconscious learning is gradually brought to the conscious level. Montessori believed children have a deep love and need for purposeful work. They work, however, not as an adult for the completion of a job, but the sake of an activity itself. It is this activity which enables them to accomplish their most important goal: the development of their individual selves – their mental, physical and psychological powers. Levy quotes Brin, "Montessori really teaches you to do things kind of on your own at your own pace and schedule. It was a pretty fun, playful environment – as is this [Google]" (p. 123). Levy (2011) explains that Google's founders purposefully followed a model of personnel management advocated by Maria Montessori, believing that an individual must be left free to explore, be creative and question the status quo.

According to Levy (2011), it is not surprising that Larry and Sergey's "Montessori-based" attitude of questioning authority is the foundation of Google's culture (p. 122). A quote from the very first list of essential values espoused by the founders Brin and Page sums up this point perfectly, "Being truly Google goes beyond painting the walls with bright colors and liberally distributing lava lamps. A Googley space is one that reflects – and supports – our employees. We are a diverse team of committed, talented, smart, thoughtful hard-working individuals. Our core values should be manifested in our working environment" (Levy, 2011).

Perks, perks and more perks.

Levy (2011) talks about the great lengths Google founders Sergey Brin and Larry Page have gone to foster and perpetuate an organizational culture that makes Google “the kind of place where the kind of people we wanted to work here would work for free” (p. 125). Levy (2011) describes Google’s culture as “emerging from its founders’ beliefs that a workplace should be loaded with perks and overloaded with intellectual stimulation” (p. 133). According to Levy (2011), Google was simply a continuation of the campus life that many Googlers had only recently left, going so far as to describe Google as creating a culture that allows employees to feel like they are still on a college campus (p. 135). Levy (2011), describes the atmosphere created by the many perks and amenities as a “charged intellectual atmosphere that makes people want to come to work” (p. 138).

Sergey Brin and Larry Page also worked closely to make sure buildings expressed Google’s values as well. Those included design features that would elicit not only a good feeling and efficiency but also their growing environmental consciousness. The centerpiece and symbol of their view of the ideal work experience was free and abundant healthful food in an atmosphere that forged employee bonding and the sharing of innovative approaches to work (Levy, 2011). Brin and Page believed that the company’s accomplishments sprang from a brew of new minds seated comfortably in the top percentile of intelligence and achievement. At the company headquarters, affectionately dubbed “the Plex”, founders Sergey Brin and Larry Page have purposefully created an atmosphere where employees have no need to leave the office. According to Levy (2011), “Food was not the most notable of the other Google perks. Without leaving the campus you could see a doctor, do Pilates and get a Swiss massage (p. 134). As an organization Google has gone to great lengths to brand itself with a very distinct and niche

culture. Internal organizational branding enables, or at least better positions, organizations to attract, hire and retain their targeted niche.

Purposeful people operations.

As Google grew Brin and Page took the advice of a business consultant and convened a meeting of top executives with the expressed goal of mapping organizational values. What came out of this meeting was a motto that will forever define them, “Do No Evil.” The motto is a summation of the basic tenets on which the company operates and reflects the fact that the founders are “good guys,” so their company must also be good. Google operates on the premise that business can be done without resorting to evil practices. Levy (2011) describes it best, “Google would be a shining beacon for the way a corporation should operate: an employee-centric, data-driven leadership pampering a stunningly bright workforce that, for its own part, lavished all its wit and wizardry on empowering users and enriching advertising customers. From those practices, the profits would roll in. Ill intentions, flimflammy, and greed had no role in the process” (p. 146). In an article on Slate.com, Manjoo (2013) points out that unlike in most sectors of the economy, the market for top-notch tech employees is stretched incredibly thin. Google fights for potential workers with Apple, Facebook, Amazon, Microsoft, and hordes of startups, so every employee’s departure triggers a costly, time-consuming recruiting process. Google monitors its employees’ well-being to a degree that can seem absurd to outsiders. If there’s any sign that joy among Googlers is on the wane, it’s the Google Human Resource (HR) department’s mission to figure out why and how to fix it. Google calls its HR department “People Operations”. Under VP of People Operations (POPS), Lazlo Bock, Google’s HR department functions more like a rigorous science lab than the pesky hall monitor most of us picture when we think of HR. At the heart of POPS is a sophisticated employee-data tracking

program, an effort to gain empirical certainty about every aspect of Google's workers' lives, not just the right level of pay and benefits but also such trivial-sounding details as the optimal size and shape of the cafeteria tables and the length of the lunch lines. Google leverages the expertise and mathematical acumen of its employees to make itself a better place to work through people-based analytics. POPS has contributed to several ground-breaking HR-related decisions over the years. In 2010, buffeted by the recession and increasing competition from other companies (especially Facebook), then-CEO Eric Schmidt decided to give all Googlers a raise. It was the job of POPS to determine the best way to offer that increase. The group ran a "conjoint survey" in which it asked employees to choose the best among many competing pay options. After analyzing the data, in the fall of 2010, Schmidt announced that all Google employees would get a 10 percent salary increase. Manjoo (2013) references a comment by Prasad Setty, head of the People Analytics department, that Googlers were overjoyed and that many people cite that announcement as their single happiest moment at the firm. Googlegeist numbers that year went through the roof and attrition to competing companies also declined. Google is widely recognized as a great company and is the six-time winner and currently ranked #1 on the Forbes "100 Best Places to Work" annual list. Clearly Google is doing things right, at least by contemporary standards of business and human resource practices.

Not all bad, not all good

As illustrated above, if the same criteria are used uniformly, the social utopians could be considered guilty of exploitation. Robert Owens became fabulously wealthy operating businesses populated with residents of his socialist communes, while Google could be seen as benevolent due to its widely lauded human resource policies. Whether a business is praised as benevolent or criticized as exploitative, depends mostly on the presuppositional bias of critic,

Eudaimonia: Using Aristotle to Inform Organizational Communication in Order to Reimagine Human Resource Management

who is likely entrenched in the traditional mode of thinking which dictates that capitalism demands a winner and a loser.

It is important to clarify my position on the issue of praise and blame. Although I believe Google has been given un-deserved label of exploitative and Owen was dubbed benevolent, neither are without blame, and praise. Google, as noted above, does a lot of things right when it comes to human resource practices and has many awards and accolades to prove their worthiness. That being said, I recognize that Google engages in the extreme levels of human resource management with the desire to ultimately lessen its expenses. Yes, it wants to retain the best people, but not so that the people can earn a living and be happy, but because Google wants to be successful and realizes it needs to retain top-tier employees in order to reach its goals. Google is not altruistic or benevolent, they operate with a cold, calculating precision, making people decisions that will ultimately enable them to stay on top. I am reminded of the self-admitted level of data analytics in which Google engages and the purely data-based people decisions it derives from such extensive research. Google makes people decisions based on research of their top employees with the expressed purpose of keeping those very same people happy enough to stay. The intention and desired outcome of Google's people operations is not the happiness of employees (considered individually and collectively), rather a created emotional state in its employees which compels them to continue working for Google. Google extracts a significant amount of productivity from its workers. As a counterbalance it provides them with perks and amenities specifically designed to enhance their comfort. Google is certainly not altruistic. It is exploitative. Google makes decisions, even ones with positive employee outcomes, with the selfish motive of attaining its goals and objectives. For Google, top-tier

employees are a necessary commodity and one for which they are willing to pay, as long as it facilitates their end game of being the best.

Owen, on the other hand, seems to have survived history with a favorable reputation. Owen, like Google, is neither a saint nor a sinner, rather a little of both. Owen's intentions and ideals may have been altruistic, but they also lead him to a life of great wealth and celebrity. His socialist communities, who coincidentally populated his factories, operated on the notion of egalitarianism, while Owen made a sizable profit from the operation of those very factories. He did not share the profits equally and his workers did not receive a fair return on their invested labor. He was the very capitalist Marx derided, earning far more benefit than labor invested. Despite his financial success, Owen seems to have been judged solely on his intentions and ideals, which were altruistic and utopian.

Traditional critiques are based on a hermeneutic of suspicion and a presupposition that capitalism is a win-lose scenario, with business as the winner despite being intrinsically evil and with people as the losers despite being intrinsically good. History's critics have taken a position on Google and Owen, based primarily on the bias of the times, most notably a Hobbesian view of man and Marxist view of capitalism. The Hobbesian bifurcation of winners and losers, also espoused by Marx, is historically and philosophically problematic. The following chapter will offer a new paradigmatic orientation through which interactions between individuals can be philosophically re-grounded.

CHAPTER TWO

Reciprocity as the New Paradigm

A different paradigm, reciprocity, is offered as an alternative to the Hobbesian paradigm shown lacking. The Hobbesian paradigm in which relationships are essentially a competition with incompatible self-interests leading to a winner and a loser is an inaccurate, albeit a traditionally accepted philosophical underpinning for social critique. The unexamined assumption of the validity of the egoism/altruism dichotomy has led to an inherent bias on the part of the critics, and therefore needs to be replaced with the Aristotelian concept of reciprocity as the dominant paradigm for interactions between individuals. . In order to truly understand the traditional historical perspective, an exploration of Hobbes with a new complementary point from Beinhocker is offered, bolstered by insight from McIntyre on ego/altruism and Meikle's interpretation of Aristotle on the polis. Aristotle's thoughts on household management versus wealth-getting activities, including a discussion of money and the concept of enough, is explored. A discussion of human nature with connections being made to reciprocity as well as a foray into interpersonal communication literature, specifically Buber and Levinas rounds out the chapter.

The Hobbesian paradigm in which relationships are essentially a competition with incompatible self-interests leading to a winner and a loser is an inaccurate, albeit a traditionally accepted philosophical underpinning for social critique. The unexamined assumption of the validity of the egoism/altruism dichotomy has led to an inherent bias on the part of the critics, and therefore needs to be replaced with the Aristotelian concept of reciprocity as the dominant paradigm for interactions between individuals.

A Traditional View of Hobbes

The traditional interpretation of Hobbes is that he views man as aggressive and driven. Tuck (1989) describes Hugo Grotius's view, as a precursor to Hobbes, as being that man has a fundamental right to preserve themselves and should avoid unnecessarily injuring others. For Grotius, social life was not possible if either of these propositions were denied by members of society (Tuck, 1989, p. 26). Grotius minimal set of core rights and duties were the building blocks for Hobbes's "state of nature" where all men find themselves simply qua men and onto which all other "appurtenances of civil life" can be grafted (Tuck, 1989, p. 28). Grotius made self-preservation into a moral principal and the foundational natural right upon which all known moralities and codes of social behavior were constructed. This was balanced by the second fundamental duty to avoid harming others unless your own self-preservation is at stake. For Grotius, and later Hobbes, there was an acceptable amount of violence in a society. Too much violence in the form of unrestrained attacks on others and social life would not work. Too little violence, in that individuals were not permitted to defend themselves, and a few violent men would destroy the rest (Tuck, 1989, p. 61). Hobbes in *Elements of Law* describes his position of man's right of self-preservation, "It is therefore a right of nature: that every man preserve his own life and limbs, with all the power he hath" (1.14.6). Hobbes found it absurd and illogical to think that self-preservation could best be obtained in a state of war rather than a state of peace, or civil society. Macpherson (1954) interpreted Hobbes as putting an emphasis on pride, or vain glory, as a basic drive of the individual and sees Hobbes as not merely describing the character of men in his contemporary society, but as attributing these characteristics to man's eternal nature. According to Macpherson, Hobbes made the point that man is not by nature a social animal (p. 525). Tuck (1989), on the other hand, interprets Hobbes to see man as not wanting to

harm other men for the sake of harming them: rather they wish for power over them, but only to secure their own preservation (p. 65). According to Tuck (1989) the common idea that Hobbes was pessimistic about human nature is not accurate and Hobbes's natural man, like that of Grotius, is in principle stand-offish towards others rather than inherently belligerent (p. 65).

Man essentially entered into social relationships as a convenience and to avoid social war, a kind of self-interest disguised as altruism under social contracts. In chapter XIII of *Leviathan* Hobbes asserts that the natural condition of mankind is virtually equal in respect to the mind and body so much so that "one man can thereupon claim to himself any benefit to which another may not pretend" (p. 74). The problem arises when two men desire the same thing which they both cannot enjoy. It is at this point when their wants become incommensurable that men become enemies and will endeavor to destroy or subdue one another. According to Hobbes (1994), men only enter into social relationships out of the need for self-preservation; to build a force of strength sufficient to ward off would-be attackers, or other men who wish to possess his goods. Hobbes (1994) emphasizes this point in chapter XIII, paragraph 5. "Again, man has no pleasure, but on the contrary a great deal of grief, in keeping company where there is not power able to over-awe them all" (p. 75). Here he is pointing out that man only wants and enjoys social relationships that create security through a show of strength sufficient to assure his own preservation. In the introduction to his translation of *Leviathan*, Curley (1994) points out that Hobbes contends that by nature people are sufficiently unsocial that if they had to live without an effective government to check them, they would find themselves in a "war of all against all", stemming from their reaction to a need for self-preservation discussed next (p. viii). Hobbes mentions three principal causes which compel men to quarrel; competition, diffidence and glory. In the first instance man may choose to invade, or go to war with another, for the purposes of

gain; as described earlier, he desires that upon which another has an equal claim. He may also choose to invade out of diffidence, or concern, for another's potential to overtake him. Lastly man may choose to quarrel out of the desire for glory to enhance their reputation and thus make themselves a less likely target for invasion. Hobbes makes the point clearly in Chapter xiii paragraph 8, "it is manifest that during the time men live without a common power to keep them all in awe, they are in that condition which is called war, and such a war is of every man against every man. In such condition ... continual fear and danger of violent death, and the life of man, solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short" (*Leviathan*, 1994, p. 76).

Defining "the good".

The idea underlying this interpretation is the fact that Hobbes (1994) describes man as wanting to preserve his own interests, namely his well-being. Man will avoid harming other people except when preservation is at stake. Man will desire that which is good, defining good as that which aids in self-preservation, thus creating a moral relativism centered around the desires of man. In his book *Hobbes: A Very Short Introduction* (1989) Tuck quotes Hobbes in Elements of Law (1.7.3) to point out the relativist idea.

Every man, for his own part, calleth that which pleaseth, and is delightful to himself, GOOD; and that Evil which displeaseth him; insomuch that while every man differeth from other in constitution, they differ also one from another concerning the common distinction of good and evil. Nor is there any such thing as *agathon haplos*, that is to say simply good. For even the goodness which we attribute to God Almighty, is his goodness to us. And as we call good and evil the things that please and displease us; so call we goodness and badness, the qualities of powers whereby they do it. (Tuck, 1989, pp. 62-63)

Hobbes also speaks to man's desire for what is good in *Leviathan* IV, paragraph 7; "But whatsoever is the object of any man's appetite or desire that is it which he for his part calleth good; and the object of his hate and aversion evil" (*Leviathan*, 1994, pp. 28-29). Hobbes is again making it clear that man's position of what is good or evil is entirely dependent on whether or not the thing, not another man, will aid in self-preservation. MacIntyre (1999) offers a look into what man sees as the good. In *Dependent Rational Animals* he provides us with a three-fold classification of the ascription of good. First, as a means; things are good only as a means to something further that is itself good. Second, to judge someone good in some role or at discharging some function within some socially established practice is to judge that agent good insofar as there are goods internal to that activity that are genuine goods, goods that are to be valued as ends worth pursuing for their own sake. And third, we judge unconditionally about what is best for individuals or groups to be or do or have not only as agents engaged in this or that form of activity in this or that role or roles, but also as human beings. It is these judgments that are judgments about human flourishing (pp. 66-67). How far human beings in particular situations need to articulate, to reflect upon and to evaluate those different types of tacit or explicit judgments about goods which furnish them with their reasons for acting varies from culture to culture (MacIntyre, 1999, p. 67). MacIntyre (1999) points out the connection to Aristotle's virtues in that the judgements of what it means to flourish, or get enough good, is really a question of what virtues are and what it is to live the kind of life that exercise of the virtues requires (p.77). In order to realize the good, which the exercise of the virtues makes possible, man must reason together within some determinate social relationships. So the good of each cannot be pursued without also pursuing the good of all those who participate in those relationships. It is difficult for man to have an understanding of our own good, of our own

flourishing, apart from, and independent of, the flourishing of a set of social relationships in which we have found our place (McIntyre, 1999, pp.107-108). Man is a social creature and must deal with his own flourishing while at the same time being mindful of the social relationships necessary for societal flourishing. Man is concerned primarily with his own well-being.

Looking again to Hobbes, in chapter xviii of *Leviathan* he speaks to what he sees as the final cause, end, or design of men, who he again interjects naturally love liberty and seek dominion over others only as a means of self-preservation. Evidence for self-preservation as paramount can be seen in the introduction of restraint, enabling them to live in commonwealths leading to a more contented life thus getting themselves out from that miserable condition of war, necessarily a consequence of the natural passions of men geared toward self-preservation. It is here that Hobbes also comments on the necessity of a central power to keep man in check. He believes there must be a visible power to keep man in awe and tie them, by fear of punishment, to the performance of their covenants and observation of those laws of nature (*Leviathan*, 1994, p. 106). Macpherson (1954) also reads Hobbes to consider dominion, not society, as the natural state of man with fear as the limiting factor making society possible and eliminating the struggle of each for power over others. In his article *Hobbes Today* Macpherson quotes Hobbes:

We must therefore resolve, that the original of all great and lasting societies consisted not in the mutual good will men had towards each other, but in the mutual fear they had of each other. It is, not merely that men seek material gain, but that the competitive search for gain is a constant drive dominating the whole character of the individual. The most frequent reason why men desire to hurt each other, ariseth hence, that many men at the same time have an appetite to the same thing; which yet very often they can neither enjoy

in common, nor yet divide it; whence it follows that the strongest must have it, and who is strongest is decided by the sword. Hence again the fear each has of the other where there is no power able to overawe them all, and hence each man's need to be a member of a society which will have that power. (Macpherson, 1945, pp. 526-527)

The postulate of the dominance of competitive material appetites is crucial to Hobbes's theory of the state. The argument is that men are fundamentally hostile to each other because they have appetites for things which they cannot enjoy in common, and of which there is such scarcity that all who want them cannot have them. It may be said that this scarcity has always existed, but Hobbes's assumption is that men are so conscious of it, and are so determined to avoid it for their part, that their actions are dominated by this consciousness. We need not be surprised, then, that to Hobbes, all the relations between men tend to be the relations of the market (Macpherson, 1954).

A Contrary View Provided by MacIntyre

The problem, as I have asserted, is the fact that philosophers, economists and social critics have adopted as their own Hobbes's description of man as being in constant struggle and competition with other men for limited resources used as a means of self-preservation. MacIntyre (1967) takes a contrary position in which human relationships are based on reciprocity, or mutual benefit. For MacIntyre (1967) Hobbes detaches the doctrines of natural law from their Aristotelian frameworks and is the first major philosopher to present a completely *individualistic* picture of human nature. MacIntyre (1967) interprets there to be three sources for Hobbes's individualism. First is his preoccupation with civil war lived out in the constant struggle of one private interest over another. Second is Hobbes's commitment to the Galilean resolutive-compositive method of explanation; to explain is to resolve a complex whole into its individual

parts and to show how the individual parts must be combined in order to restrict the whole.

Accordingly, for Hobbes, social life is broken down into individual men who must combine if social life is to be (re)structured by means of social contract. Thirdly, individuals are presocial and lack the characteristics of compromise and are governed only by their presocial drives. Misinterpretors, believe presocial drives must be competitive and aggressive because of the will to power over other men is what ceaselessly and restlessly drives men forward. Thus what emerges is a picture of human nature as individual, non-social, competitive and aggressive.

With the three tenets of individualism as a presupposition, altruism and benevolence in any situation must be explained. McIntyre points out how traditional interpretations of Hobbes explain away what appears to be altruism as disguised self-seeking with undisguised self-seeking leading to social war. The fear of war leads to the adoption of a regard for others from purely self-interested motives; altruistic behavior (or at least behavior) is in our immediate interest as a means of preserving ourselves from the war of all against all (“Egoism and Altruism”, 1967). McIntyre also looked to Hume’s explanation in *Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding* that self-interest and “a tendency to public good and to the promoting of peace, harmony, and order in society” are two independent, coexistent springs of action. For MacIntyre, Hume sees the independent power of sympathy and of a sense of the public good, rather than a rational view of what is of long-term benefit to self-interest, as moving us to benevolence and altruism.

In his article “*Egoism and Altruism*”, McIntyre (1967) elucidates the idea that self-interest is an abstraction and only has application in situations when one must decide to be competitive or noncompetitive. If decisions around self-interest are reserved only when one makes a purposeful decision to engage in violent behavior, as a means of attaining some desired good to the end of self-preservation, this is the only time benevolence and altruism have

application and are limited circumstances that should not be considered paradigmatic. McIntyre points out that in neither Plato nor Aristotle does altruistic benevolence appear in the list of virtues, and consequently the problem of how human nature, constituted as it is, can exhibit this virtue cannot arise. McIntyre states clearly that reciprocity is the proper paradigm to interpret relationships, and is the basis for exchange as evidenced by the fact that the polis operated based on *philia*, or mutual regard. McIntyre looks also to the medieval world where the underlying assumption is that man's self-fulfillment is discovered in the love of God and the rest of the divine creation ("Egoism and Altruism", 1967).

Strong Reciprocity

Beinhocker (2006) in his work *The Origin of Wealth*, offers a new interpretation of reciprocity through the lens of an economic/social experiment called the "Prisoner's Dilemma". In this experiment participants play the role of criminals that have been arrested after perpetrating a crime. An interrogator puts the two suspects in different rooms so they cannot communicate and then proceeds to tell each suspect that if he testifies against his partner, he will be released, provided his partner does not testify against him. If both testify against each other, both will go to jail with a reduced penalty for cooperation. Each is faced with a dilemma simultaneously; either stay quiet or testify against their partner. If both stay quiet, both will go free due to lack of evidence (which they do not know). If one chooses to stay quiet and his partner testifies, the quiet partner will go to jail for a long time. Both participants are simultaneously faced with the dilemma, not knowing what the other will do. Beinhocker (2006) points out how the prisoner's dilemma is best navigated by way of what he calls a non-zero-sum-game (p. 222) in which "if you scratch my back, I'll scratch yours and together we can do something neither can do as well on our own and we both benefit" (p. 265). Cooperation enables

both parties to capture a gain unattainable as an individual. This stands in direct contrast to a zero-sum-gain in which there must be a winner and a loser where one person's gain comes at the expense of another's loss. The zero sum gain is analogous to the traditional Marxian perspective on capitalism which requires a winner and a loser. According to Beinhocker (2006), the prisoner's dilemma gives us insight into the conundrum we face with the operation of our economy because it depends on cooperative activity to work. People must work together to produce things and trade with each other (p. 223). As in the prisoner's dilemma, in the economy, there is a constant tension between cooperating for the greater good and pursuing one's own self-interest. Wright (2000) argues in his book *Non Zero* that much of human history can be summed up as the outcome of the struggle between cooperation and self-interest. For Wright (2000), in a world with limited resources there are competitive pressures to cooperate because societies that learn to organize in order to maximize cooperation tend to dominate those who do not.

Beinhocker (2006) lists what he sees as the four basic sources for non-zero-sum magic: the division of labor, the heterogeneity of people, the benefits of increasing returns to scale and the smoothing out of uncertainties over time. The division of labor refers to the fact that if two people of slightly different skill sets, it makes sense for them to focus on what they do best and trading. The heterogeneity of people, the fact that there is cacophony of different needs and tastes, creates opportunities to trade for mutual benefit. The benefits of increasing returns to scale illustrates how joining forces with others naturally increases everyone's odds of success while at the same time reducing the amount of individual investment needed compared to greater expected returns. Cooperating is a great way to mitigate risk and smooth out uncertainties over time. If you are part of a cooperative group, your peers can help you out in lean times with the expectation that you do the same in return (p. 267). Beinhocker (2006) acknowledges the issue

of distribution of the spoils as a crucial question. If the rewards of cooperation are not distributed wrongly, cooperation will collapse and the non-zero-sum gains evaporate (p. 267).

When talking about the difficulty of achieving cooperation and the ever more difficult task of maintaining cooperation, Beinhocker (2006) asserts that cheating is a major issue; “The incentive to cheat means that cooperation is inherently difficult to achieve and potentially unstable even once achieved” (p. 268). Looking at the issue from an economic perspective, if cheating is rewarded with greater benefits, it will be repeated. The solution has been described as “strong reciprocity” by Thales (2016). The idea is two-fold; the benefits from cooperation must be significant enough to induce continued loyal participation and the punishment for cheating must be significant enough to make cheating not worth the risk. Going back to the prisoner’s dilemma as a reference, Beinhocker (2006) summarizes the most effective strategy for entering into a non-zero-sum relationship, like that of cooperation in the market, as “I will begin on the assumption of mutual cooperation. If you cheat on me, however, not only will I refuse to cooperate, but I will punish you, even to my own near-term detriment. After some time, I might forgive you and try cooperating again, just in case your cheating was an error or miscommunication, or on the chance you have reformed your ways. If you cheat again, the probability of my forgiving you again will become lower and my punishment even more terrible” (p. 269). Beinhocker (2006) believes, as humans, evolution has made us naturally inclined to cooperate in order to realize the riches of non-zero-sum gains while also equipping us with sensitivity to cheating, expectations of fairness and a willingness to mete out punishment to those we believe cross the line (p. 269).

Beinhocker’s (2006) cooperation is analogous to Aristotelean reciprocity. His major contribution to the ongoing conversation around reciprocity as the appropriate paradigm for

interactions between individuals is the idea of “strong reciprocity” (Thames, 2016). Strong reciprocity brings into the picture the threat of punishment for those who choose to violate the social contract of cooperation. The idea is that you need to be part of the team so that we can all achieve more together and you need to not cheat (take more than your fair share or fail to contribute equally) at the fear of punishment. Be part of the team and do as we agreed, or else! Cooperation (reciprocity) is our natural inclination as humans. Strong reciprocity is the natural evolution of traditional reciprocity.

Aristotle and the Polis

Refocusing on Aristotle, Meikle’s (1995) interpretation of Aristotle’s *polis* is that it exists for the sake of the good life facilitated by the division of labor (increased productivity through specialization) which necessitates exchange (increased cohesion through mutual need). Most relationships are reciprocal and occur out of mutual need. The family is the basic unit of society and is what constitutes the *polis*. The common theme for Aristotle is the process of exchange, which he sees as natural, in which members of society cooperate in the use of their common human capacities to make or grow things that will satisfy their needs (Meikle, 1995, p.44). Our being is bound up in the *polis*. We are political in the sense of the necessity of the *polis* to become what we are; the *polis* does not exist without us but we do not exist without the *polis* (Thames, lecture, 2011). The *polis*, is first and foremost is a language community, a group that speaks to one another. We are political in the sense that we only learn or speak because we have been taught or spoken to. If language is our defining characteristic (as Aristotle described us - animals with *logos*), and the characteristic that illustrates our unique political nature, where is language housed and where does it exist? Language exists among us, not within us. The capacity to use language exists within us but it has to be called out, a call and response. This

perspective lends to our understanding of the *polis* because we cannot exist without the *polis* and the *polis* cannot exist without us. Along with language we also get rationality. Another meaning found within *logos* is rational. You cannot have language without the *polis* and cannot have logic without language, therefore we cannot exist or become what we are absent the *polis*. Aristotle provides us with the idea of a mutuality in being; the self cannot be without the other; we are beholden to someone in terms of our very being.

The *polis*, Aristotle says, comes into existence for the sake of life, but it exists for the sake of the good life; it is not merely for defense and exchanging goods; it is a partnership in living well (Meikle, 1995, p. 75). For Aristotle the *polis* does not exist without us and we do not exist without the *polis*. We are called into language and into rational thinking. There is a kind of call and response which is the first example of reciprocity. Only in the *polis* are we capable of becoming all that which we are capable (like an acorn growing into an oak). Thames (lecture, 2011) drawing from Randall (1962), states that the *polis* is first and foremost a language community, a group that speaks to one another. We are political in the sense that we only learn or speak because we have been taught or spoken to; first we are the animal that listens, we listen to one another which in direct contrast to communicative patterns of other animals. This distinction is more prevalent in gesture as human beings are the only animals that point; motor skills are uniquely human. The extent we attend to one another is important because we attend to one another in a way that other animals do not, emphasizing the essential nature of the reciprocal relationship necessary for human flourishing (Thames, lecture, 2011).

Aristotle talks about two different types of cooperation between individuals in the *polis*; one for household management (*oikonomike*) and the other for wealth-getting (*chrematistike*). Household management, for Aristotle, “must either find ready at hand, or itself provide, such

things necessary to life, and useful for the community of the family or state” (Pol. 1, 1256b27-30). Aristotle spends considerable time and effort drawing a clear distinction between use and exchange value. In ancient society a thing is defined by its “use value”. Quality is the only concern in making or producing a product. Aristotle recognizes the potential negative effect of money stating that any activity can be corrupted by money. Society is concerned with use and the idea of quality. Exchange drives people to gather in the *polis* to take advantage of the division of labor. Money is introduced as a manner of facilitating exchange, especially for facilitating exchange over time and distance. In this sense, money exists only as a means. Exchange should be a matter of *philia*, or the love of the brother or said another way, reciprocity. Aristotle sees the process of exchange (reciprocity) as natural to man in which people cooperate in the use of their natural capacities to make or grow things that will satisfy their needs (Meikle, 1995, p. 44). Under this model you are not trying to take advantage of someone, rather you are making a good faith exchange. *Philia* ultimately holds the *polis* together and creates the need for the division of labor and exchange. Once money is introduced as a medium of exchange, the issue of wealth takes on a new dimension. The idea of wealth has always existed, the introduction of money creates a competing definition, one based on accumulation, that Aristotle rejects. For Aristotle, and the ancients, wealth is the available stock of products useful for leading the good life. Although there is no notion of “enough” in modern economics, there is in Aristotle’s time. According to Meikle (1995) Aristotle defines wealth as part of the good life and consists of tools or useful things that are limited in size and number by the number of ends they serve. In this sense, the good life and its constitutive ends set the boundary for how much wealth is enough (p. 45). The end is limited in the case of natural *chrematistike*, or true wealth, because, being defined as the stock of things that are useful, a natural limit is reached when there

is enough of them. Enough meaning enough for the good life (pp. 49-50). For Aristotle, money serves as a means. The problem is that if you pursue a means, then the pursuit is endless, irrational, and unnatural. There are natural limits to consumption, means, and wealth. The intent of money is to function as a means; it has no other reason to exist, no use or end other than as a means, therefore there is no limit to its acquisition. The introduction of money was a seismic shift. As the focus of attention shifted to the quantity of goods and/or money away from the quality of an individual good, the introduction of money became an important and formative event in the development of the “modern” economy (Meikle, 1995). The traditional (ancient) concern was for a good’s use value, or the idea that a good was valued based on its functionality and usefulness which also included its quality. Goods were traded for in the spirit of reciprocity. Those who were skilled at growing corn traded with those who could not or did not grow corn but were skilled at producing something else of use. It was essentially a barter economy with good X being traded for good Y in quantities agreed upon to be fair by the participants. The idea of reciprocity is powerful in that it drove the ancient economy. Ideally, a person strove only to strike a fair bargain with his counterpart in the transaction. Each person receiving an amount of goods equal in use value to those traded away. You trade out of your surplus to satisfy a deficiency out of another’s surplus thereby satisfying their deficiency.

For Meikle (1995), Aristotle seeks to uncover our surety in the justice of exchange so that we end up with equal and/or reciprocal proportions but is unable to find this quantifiable thing, as it does not exist in nature. The problem of exchange starts to emerge in a profound way based on the division of labor. The expansion of the world necessitated the introduction of a medium of exchange. As the world grew and cities became the epicenter of trade, it became necessary to have a method of exchange for those who wished to purchase from and sell their goods to those

who, at the current time, have nothing of use of which to barter. Enter money as medium of exchange. It is important to remember that money is a rhetorical tool and is an idea not a thing (Thames, lecture, 2011). It does not occur in nature and it is an idea that human beings created. Money has worth only because of an agreement: by agreeing it becomes part of the human world (Nomos). If you don't believe in the idea then money is worthless. Money can be anything you want it to be by agreement: if there is no agreement, money does not exist. The problem is that the idea of money is very seductive. In a traditional hunter-gatherer society you have a natural division of labor resulting in numerous efficiencies such as specialization and the development and improvement of tools. The notion of the division of labor births a greater efficiency of labor resulting in the development of surpluses. People engaged in exchanging commodity for commodity: $C-C^1$. Once money is introduced, it facilitates exchange over time and distance which modifies exchange into commodity – money – commodity: $C-M-C^1$. This is possible because money is typically something that is durable and stable. In NE 5 Aristotle provides the first clear statement of money as a store of value when he states “money serves as a guarantee of exchange in the future: supposing we need nothing at the moment, it ensures that exchange shall be possible when a need arises, for it meets the requirement of something we can produce in payment so as to obtain the thing we need” (1133b 10-13). The natural evolution, at least according to Marx, of the exchange equation becomes money – commodity – money: $M-C-M^1$. Money in effect, facilitated the switch from use value to exchange value in economics. It is important to note that for Aristotle the exchange equation of $M-C-M^1$ is a perversion and one that he rejects. When this shift occurs and exchanges occur without a commodity, then exchange value can be pursued without convention in the form of money - money: $M-M^1$, resulting in the concept of usury, or lending money for money. Aristotle speaks harshly about usury, “the most

hated sort, and with the greatest reason, is usury, which makes a gain out of money itself, and not from the natural object of it. For money was intended to be used in exchange, but not to increase at interest... Wherefore all modes of getting wealth, this is the most unnatural” (1258b 1-8).

This concept was widely panned and even forbidden in ancient societies and some religions.

According Meikle (1995) Aristotle believes that the use made of a thing in exchanging it is good or bad depending on the end served by the exchange. Exchanging a thing in the C—M—C¹ circuit is good because it brings together use values and needs. The use made of a thing in the M—C—M¹ circuit is bad because the end is bad (p. 55).

Human Nature

Switching our focus to the issue of human nature illustrates how the human variable in the economic equation is of profound importance. The issue of human nature will shed light on man’s motivations as well as his desires, both latent and explicit.

Aristotle's main premise in the *Politics* is that humans are naturally political animals. This is different approach than other political theorists, and social contract theorists, many of whom claim that we enter the contract because of protection, or because we are generally dependent upon each other. Aristotle's (1986) view is unique because he thinks we are political and cannot realize out potential outside of the *polis*. Man is by nature a political animal. For Aristotle (1986) people have a telos. Telos is the main virtue of something, for example the telos of a pen is to write. In this regard, the telos of humans is rationality. Also, in terms of his ethics, he felt that the highest form of life, and the highest pursuit of life, was that of politics.

For Hobbes (1994) human beings are physical objects, sophisticated machines all of whose functions and activities can be described and explained in purely mechanistic terms. Even thought itself, therefore, must be understood as an instance of the physical operation of the

human body. Sensation, for example, involves a series of mechanical processes operating within the human nervous system, by means of which the sensible features of material things produce ideas in the brains of the human beings who perceive them (Hobbes, 1994). Human action is similarly to be explained on Hobbes's view. Specific desires and appetites arise in the human body and are experienced as discomforts or pains which must be overcome. Thus, for Hobbes (1994) each of us is motivated to act in such ways as we believe likely to relieve our discomfort, to preserve and promote our own well-being. Everything we choose to do is strictly determined by this natural inclination to relieve the physical pressures that impinge upon our bodies. Human volition is nothing but the determination of the will by the strongest present desire. Hobbes nevertheless supposed that human agents are free in the sense that their activities are not under constraint from anyone else. On this compatibilist view, we have no reason to complain about the strict determination of the will so long as we are not subject to interference from outside ourselves. As Hobbes acknowledged, this account of human nature emphasizes our animal nature, leaving each of us to live independently of everyone else, acting only in his or her own self-interest without regard for others. This produces what he called the "state of war," a way of life that is certain to prove "solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short" (Hobbes 1994, p. 13). The only escape is by entering into contracts with each other, mutually beneficial agreements to surrender our individual interests in order to achieve the advantages of security that only a social existence can provide.

On analyzing Karl Marx's views on human nature, it is necessary to discuss them in the context of his general philosophical views and ideas. In this respect, it should be pointed out that Marx viewed the development of human beings as well as human nature at large as a historical process that is susceptible to changes in the course of development of human beings and human

society. In fact, he believes that all history is but a continuous transformation of human nature (Marx, 1990). He viewed human nature as a complex phenomenon that changes and evolves in the process of its development. Basically, Marx stands on the ground that there is little that is really essential to human nature. In this respect, he differs dramatically from the philosophers of the past who supported essentialists' views, such as Plato. Instead, Marx rejects views on human nature as some fixed, universally necessary and transcendent phenomenon underlying its changeable nature. Marx stands on a solid anthropocentric position underlying the role of humans in the process of historical development of human society. Such a position is quite logical, taking into consideration his ideas concerning the process of development of human society as a process of the constantly changing formations marking the shift from one social formation, based on certain way of production, to another. Human nature turns to be a constantly changeable and progressing phenomenon dependent on the historical experience acquired by people in the course of their development. Karl Marx viewed human nature as a very complicated process, in which social relations between individuals play probably the crucial role. Marx considered social relations an essential part of human life and they were actually the natural characteristic of human beings. In fact, he traditionally considered social relations as the basis of the human development, and, thus, it is possible to estimate that social relations were the constituent element of human nature. He underlines that human beings cannot exist in isolation from the society that means that it would be against human nature if an individual developed in isolation from the rest of the society. Marx argues that society does not consist of individuals, but expresses the sum of interrelation, the relations within which these individuals stand (Marx, 1990). Marx views creativity as an essential part of human nature. It is human creativity that actually distinguishes humans from all the other living beings. Thus, it is the really unique

characteristic of humans and human nature. Marx believes that human creativity is a very powerful tool that can change not only social relations but human nature itself. In fact, according to Marx, creativity is the tool with which human beings actually shape their nature because it is due to human creativity that humans constantly progress and develop and this is due to creativity one formation is gradually changed by another, more progressive one (Marx, 1990).

Adam Smith believes that human beings are motivated by self-interest. Self-interest is certainly, in Smith's view, a powerful motive in human behavior, but it is by no means the only motive. Smith makes sympathy the basis for our concern for others. For Smith, we form our idea of how others feel by considering how we would feel in like circumstances. This concern for others comes about because of the existence of sympathetic responses, strengthened because mutual sympathy is pleasurable and reinforced by a complex, although very important, influence, which Smith terms the impartial spectator or conscience, which leads us to act in the way which an outside observer would approve (Coase, 1976). The behavior induced by such factors is embodied in codes of conduct and these, because conformity with them brings approval and admiration. Smith's account of the development of our moral sentiments is essentially self-centered. We care for others because, by a sympathetic response, we feel as they feel, because we enjoy the sharing of sympathy, because we wish to appear admirable in our own eyes; and we conform to the rules of conduct accepted in society largely because we wish to be admired by others. The impact of these factors is weakened by the fact that the forces generating feelings of benevolence have to overcome those arising from self-interest, more narrowly conceived, with the perception of the outcomes distorted by self-deceit (Coase, 1976).

Money and Work Enter the Equation

The issue of work will help to illustrate the profound transformation occurring in the arena of economics. Work was considered to be a natural part of life in ancient society. Work was done in order that basic needs were met. The idea was that man worked to provide for himself and his family with no mind toward surplus. This is where the principle of reciprocity was important. If a surplus was present then barter was made with another man with a surplus in a commodity for which you had a lack. He satisfied his need with your surplus while you satisfied your need with his surplus, in effect, a reciprocal arrangement. Goods were considered the result of work and were valued as a whole. A man's work and the end product of that work were a matter of pride, not to be valued simply for the labor involved, rather, appreciated for its usefulness and artistic quality. With the introduction of the idea of exchange value, work was changed forever. Work became labor, a commodity that could be quantified and measured. If goods were valued based on the exchange rate of goods for money, as discussed earlier, the view of work was radically modified. In ancient societies people preferred to be slaves rather than paid hourly because hourly wages were seen as the lowest of the low in terms of society (Thames, lecture, 2011). Labor was broken down into a commodity and was a unit of cost in the calculation of the exchange rate of goods.

Enough.

Now that society and economics were focused on exchange rather than use value, the never before considered issue of consumption and the concept of enough came into focus. Douglas & Isherwood in their book *The World of Goods* provide us with some important coordinates on the issue of consumption, "Consumption has to be recognized as an integral part of the same social system that accounts for the drive to work, itself a part of the social need to

relate to other people, and to have mediating materials for relating to them” (1996, pp. viii).

Consumption in ancient societies was based mostly on need. Ancient economies were designed to facilitate a reciprocal transaction enabling both parties to satisfy deficits through an exchange of surplus. Once money entered into the equation and labor and work were commoditized, consumption left reciprocity behind in favor of transactions designed to accumulate wealth.

Skidelsky & Skidelsky (2012) see Aristotle to have two main concerns with the concept of exchange; the power to subordinate the proper end of every human activity to the ancillary end of money making and the concept of insatiability (p. 75). For Skidelsky & Skidelsky (2012)

Aristotle uses the Delphian knife as an example of to illustrate how when one does things primarily for profit and not for their own sake, the results are usually shoddy items good at neither (p. 75). Insatiability is a problem because use-values have a natural controlling end: the good life. To pursue them beyond this point is useless. Money, on the other hand, has no controlling end. The pursuit of money or wealth has no perfect end so the concept of enough has no application to it (Skidelsky & Skidelsky, 2012, p. 75).

Interpersonal Communication Perspectives

As one looks to texture the discussion about reciprocity with additional viewpoints, there is much to be gained from a foray in the genre of interpersonal communication literature, specifically the work of Buber and as a counterpoint Levinas. Because both differ from Aristotle on the specific definition of reciprocity, I look to them only for support on the larger reciprocity/relationship issue. Much of the interpersonal communication literature is based in psychology, therefore I will take a philosophic approach when creating connections to reciprocity.

Buber's I-Thou.

In *I-Thou* Buber is writing to describe the optimal conditions that exist which allow us as human beings to communicate with one another. Dialogue is essential and the natural consequence of the recognition of the other in an I-Thou and an I-It relationship that is by nature reciprocal. His philosophy can best be understood through the metaphor *the narrow ridge*. “I have occasionally described my standpoint to my friends as the narrow ridge. I wanted by this to express that I did not rest on the broad upland of a system that includes a series of sure statements about the absolute, but on a narrow rocky ridge between two gulfs where there is no sureness of expressible knowledge but the certainty of meeting what remains undisclosed” (as quoted in Friedmann, M., *Martin Buber; The Life of Dialogue*, 1955).

A look at Buber's work in *I-Thou*, gives us three distinct parts. In the first part after setting up the primary word pairs (I-Thou, I-It), he moves into the concepts of experience and relation. The I is relational, therefore, there is a relationship between the I and Thou and the I cannot be spoken of without either the Thou or It. As Buber looks at how man experiences the word he sees the world of experience belonging to the I-It while the world of relations belongs to I-Thou. It is important to note that relation for Buber equals reciprocity: My Thou acts on me as I act on it. Nothing is a component of experience or reveals itself except through the reciprocal force of confrontation. In the beginning is the relation, as the category of being, as readiness, as a form that reaches out to be filled, as a model of the soul; the *a priori* of relation; the innate you. Man becomes an I through a Thou. The individual Thou must become an It when the event of relation has run its course: the individual It can become a Thou by entering into the event of relation (Buber, 1970). In the second part of the book Buber deals more with the concept of experience and also confrontation as a condition for relating to an Other. It is solely in his power

to relate that man can live in the spirit. As man beholds what confronts him, its being is disclosed to the knower in the act of relation. Here he also talks about his idea of a community. For him there are two elements necessary for community; all people stand in a living, reciprocal relationship to a single living center and all people have to stand in a living, reciprocal relationship to one another. A community is built upon a living, reciprocal relationship, but the builder is the living, active center. In the third section, Buber presents a discussion about the divine as well as his critique of faith. He starts by clarifying that through every single Thou the basic word addresses the eternal Thou, therefore, we experience the Thou in the encounter. The Thou confronts me and I enter into a direct relationship to it. The relationship is at once being chosen and choosing, passive and active.

Looking to Glazer (1981), Buber's work may be formulated as follows, "Reality is not myself, not 'the world,' and not God. Only if I turn with my whole being to the other, if I relate to the other as to a thou, only then am I truly I, and only thus is reality established. We live in a realm in which we are addressed by a thou, or better, in which we acknowledge words spoken and events happening as an address to us, to which we respond. In true life I do not use my fellow being as I would use an object, but take part in dialogue. What matters is the openness, the trust, and the readiness to speak and to respond with which we confront the fellow man, the world, and ultimately, God."

Buber's philosophy of dialogue radically shifts the whole ground of ethical discussion by moving from the universal (Kant, 1998) to the concrete and from the past to the present. Buber does not start from some external, absolutely valid ethical code which man is to apply as best as possible to each new situation. Instead he starts with the situation itself (Friedman in Schlipp-Friedman 1967). As a way to better establish Buber's philosophy, let us look at his controversies

with spokesmen of other modern philosophies. He was, for example, opposed to Kierkegaard's dictum, "Everyone should be chary about having dealings with 'others' and should essentially speak only with God and with himself," thus becoming "a Single One." "In order to come to love," says Kierkegaard (1985) about the renunciation of his fiancé, Regina Olsen, "I had to remove the object." That, says Buber, is sublimely to misunderstand God. We are created along with one another and directed to a life with one another. For Buber, a God reached by the exclusion of his fellow-creatures would not be a God of all lives in whom all life is fulfilled. Yet, while Kierkegaard's quest for solitariness affirms at least man's communion with God, it is Max Stirner (1974), author of *The Unique One*, who eliminated the possibility of a relationship even between man and man. Stirner (1974) asserts that the man who belongs to himself alone is by origin free, for he acknowledges nothing but himself. Counter-posing Stirner, Buber (1970) proclaims that there is need of man's faith in the truth as that which is independent of him, which he cannot acquire for himself, but with which he can enter into a real relation. For Buber, the faith of human persons in the truth is that which sustains them together. Buber also opposed Martin Heidegger on the same central issue. While Kierkegaard's (1985) man stands alone before God, Heidegger's (1962) man stands before himself and nothing else, and-since in the last resort one cannot stand before oneself, he stands in his anxiety and dread before nothing. Modern, solitary man, as depicted by Heidegger, is only the result of Nietzsche's (1924) assertion that God is dead.

Vogel (1970) describes the fundamental ethical concept, the concept on which Buber's ethical thought is built, as the concept of responsibility. The content of this concept, i.e., its ethical meaning and significance, is constituted by the answers to the following two questions: 1) Responsibility for what? and 2) Responsibility to whom? These questions by their very

formulation already imply and necessitate the relational structure. Thus, from the very beginning, from the very choice of the touchstone on which his ethics will be built, Buber's ethics moves in the sphere of the relation. (Vogel, 1970) The continuity of being responsible for a Thou as well as responsive to him is essential for an ethic of personal relations. (Friedman in Schlipp-Friedman, 1967)

To the first question, "Responsibility for what?" Buber provides one and only one answer, holding fast to it throughout a lifetime of concern with the domain of ethics and in spite of shifts and changes which occurred in other aspects of his ethical thought. His answer is: one has responsibility for responding (Vogel, 1970). One cannot respond to an It, but only to a Thou. Buber, therefore, is in effect stating already in his answer to the first question that there is a responsibility to enter the I-Thou relation. Buber's answer links itself to the I-Thou context, and consequently places Buber's ethical thought in its entirety in the I-Thou domain. His ethics is grounded in his ontology of relation (Friedman in Schlipp-Friedman, 1967). This grounding could already be clearly seen in the choice of the concept of responsibility as the fundamental concept of his ethics in as much as the concept is thoroughly relational in its structure. Dialogue not only means awareness of what addresses one, but responsibility. Responsibility, for Buber, means responding (Friedman in Schlipp-Friedman, 1967). Having grounded his ethics in his ontology, Buber must proceed to define responsibility in terms of responding, namely, he must maintain that the responsibility required ethically is for responding. For Buber's ontological formulation states not only that concrete, real being is being-in-relation but furthermore that authentically realized being is being in the I-Thou relation specifically (Friedman in Schlipp-Friedman, 1967). The I-Thou relation, however, in its ontological formulation is a relation of meeting constituted of address and response. The ontologically realized authentic being,

therefore, is a responding being. It is Buber's ontological view of what constitutes authentically realized being that justifies and indeed requires his ethical demand for responding (Vogel, 1970). The presence of a true relation, i.e., a relation between two distinct entities over against each other, is a necessary presupposition for Buber's ethical thought, since without it the two basic and essential ethical concepts, that of responsibility and that of responding, would not be feasible. The responsibility to respond is placed upon me by the Absolute Thou, it being conceived here as a fully concrete, specific, individual Thou over against me, universally and eternally present, namely, a Thou without the potentiality of ever slipping into an It. I am to respond not because of any explicit content directing me but by the mere presence of the Thou over against me, since the ontological structure of the Thou demands that I respond to it. (Vogel, 1970) Relation is mutual, even a tree can stand over against me as an equal, with its own rights and dignities and claims. Buber believes that in order for something to be ethical, it must be tied to a relational experience with the Eternal Thou, God.

The main concept of Buber's ethic is responsibility, responsibility to respond to the Thou. As we enter into a relational engagement, the Thou by its very presence calls for a response. We are responsible first to become our true self, thus leaving behind the self-centered desires, and respond to the essence of the Thou. The basis for Buber's ethics is the idea that we are called and compelled to respond to the Other and thus enter into a true dialogue. The connection to reciprocity is easily made, as Buber himself uses the term when describing the relational aspect of a call and response.

Levinas and responsibility.

Levinas gives us a counter point to Buber's relational reciprocity. Beyond any other philosophical concerns, the fundamental intuition of Levinas's philosophy is the non-reciprocal relation of responsibility. In his article *A Reciprocal Asymmetry? Levinas's Ethics Reconsidered*, Tatransky' (2008) explains that for Levinas the Other is not present to me in the same sense in which I am present to myself. The Other remains always a separate being, whose transcendence prevents me from establishing a direct relationship (p. 296). The phenomenological descriptions of intersubjective responsibility are built upon an analysis of living in the world. These are unique to Levinas. They differ from Heidegger's analytic of existence. For Levinas, an 'I' lives out its embodied existence according to modalities. It consumes the fruits of the world. It enjoys and suffers from the natural elements. It constructs shelters and dwellings. It carries on the social and economic transactions of its daily life. Yet, no event is as affectively disruptive for a consciousness holding sway in its world than the encounter with another person. In this encounter (even if it later becomes competitive or instrumental), the 'I' first experiences itself as called and liable to account for itself. It responds. The 'I's response is as if to a nebulous command. The command or summons is part of the intrinsic relationality. With the response comes the beginning of language as dialogue. The origin of language, for Levinas, is always response; a responding to another, that is, to her summons. Dialogue arises ultimately through that response (Tatransky', 2008). Although for very different reasons than Buber (1970), reciprocity, or response, occurs between me and the Other as a fundamental action resulting in a communicative act. Both Buber and Levinas make it clear that reciprocity, sometimes called response or responding, is essential in the relationship

between individuals. Interpersonal communication literature, when approached from a philosophical perspective, assists in establishing the import of reciprocity.

Reciprocity

As I have asserted and has been illustrated by a look at interpersonal scholars Buber and Levinas, reciprocity is the appropriate paradigm for interactions between individuals. In order to better understand this paradigm, I will elucidate the concept more deeply. In *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* Marx (1904) quoted Aristotle: "For neither would there have been association if there were not exchange, nor exchange if there were not equality, nor equality if there were not commensurability." The introductory clause ("for neither would there have been association if there were not exchange"), seems to make reference to reciprocity. Aristotle is describing a society in which exchange of goods was not a mechanical but a moral transaction, bringing about and maintaining relationships between individuals and groups. In Book 5 of *The Nicomachean Ethics* Aristotle's concern is with justice, that subset of virtue concerned with relations to one's neighbor (1130a3-4). After a brief section on "universal justice" he turns to "particular justice", that is, the just as the fair and the equal. Under this heading he first discusses distributive and rectificatory justice, before turning to "justice in exchange, reciprocity in accordance with proportion." (McNeil, 1990, pp. 56-58)

Reciprocity, the giving of benefits to another in return for benefits received, is a defining feature of social exchange. As Emerson (1981) noted, it is this feature that gives exchange its name: "Benefits obtained through social process are contingent upon benefits provided 'in exchange'" (p. 32). Recognition of the importance of reciprocity in social life is by no means restricted to exchange theorists, however. Hobhouse (1906, p.12) called reciprocity "the vital principle of society," Becker (1956, p. 1) referred to our species as "homo reciprocus," and

Eudaimonia: Using Aristotle to Inform Organizational Communication in Order to Reimagine Human Resource Management

Simmel (1950, p. 387) noted that social equilibrium and cohesion could not exist without "the reciprocity of service and return service." Gouldner (1960) proposed that an internalized moral obligation - "norm of reciprocity" helps assure that people help others who have helped them in the past. More recently, Nowak and Sigmund (2000) have described reciprocity as the evolutionary basis for cooperation in society (Molm, et. al, 2007, p.199).

The next section will take us back and provide some foundational information from which we can better ground ourselves in the history and development of the disciplines we are utilizing as footing.

CHAPTER THREE

Context and Historical Grounding

In order to provide context and historical grounding, the evolution of human resources as a discipline is discussed along with the complementary concept of a resource based view of an organization. Organizational culture and organizational communication are presented as an interdependent set of ideas. The major figures and corresponding paradigms in organizational communication are explored and connected to culture. The section ends with a look into the emerging disciplines of professional civility and positive organizing.

Human Resource Management

Human resource management's evolution as a discipline, and current position as a necessary business strategy, must first be explored and understood. Looking at human resource management from the perspective of its evolution and ultimately its connection to organizational culture will enable us to understand what human resources according to Aristotle would look like. Only then can we move to a discussion of some additional areas that are fertile for future research, including distributism.

The evolution of a discipline.

Human resource management must be understood in context, and that context is the marketplace. The very phrase and concept of "human resources" is relatively new. It was coined by Peter Drucker in 1954 as he described managing humans as a key element of management. Changing the name from personnel to human resources reflected a complex understanding of what motivates workers. It also helped shed the old fashioned and bureaucratic connotation of the old name (Ogilvie et al., 2003, P. 255). One could argue that the HR field dates back to the first working arrangements between master craftspeople and their apprentices.

Eudaimonia: Using Aristotle to Inform Organizational Communication in Order to Reimagine Human Resource Management

Before the Industrial Revolution, working arrangements involved close relationships between mentors and apprentices dedicated in learning a particular trade. Apprentices were often required to live in the shop or home of the master craftsman. If an apprentice was injured or sick, the master's family was responsible for restoring the young worker's health and welfare. Master and apprentice shared in good times and bad, in profit and in loss. The usefulness of this age-old relationship came to an abrupt end with the advent of the Industrial Age. In one powerful stroke, the notion of work moved from guilds and home shops to steam-driven factories (Losey, 1998, P. 40). The context for the development of HR came into its own in the late 1800's during early industrial work in the United States. The introduction of the assembly line brought a need for low-skilled employees capable of performing repetitive tasks. Management philosophy at the turn of the century was epitomized by Henry Ford, who often wondered why workers brought their heads to work when all he really needed was their hands and feet (Losey, 1998, P. 40). Although there was much change happening in where and how non-farm work was being done, there was little change in the worker-boss relationship. Manufacturing operations were huge structures filled with workers ruled over by autocratic and dictatorial bosses. There was almost zero middle management with owners serving as top managers. According to Cappelli (2000) foremen of the late 1800's engaged in an autocratic leadership style which has come to known as the "drive system" which amounted to the foremen yelling, threatening and sometimes hitting the workers to make them perform faster and harder (P. 78). Foremen of this time had control over hiring, wages, and work assignments, making them the only point of connection between the worker and the organization. As the industrial revolution took hold, time-consuming hand labor was substituted with steam power and machinery. The result was a tremendous increase in job specialization and production capabilities (Jamrog et al., 2004, P. 52). As capabilities and

capacities grew, problems related to productions and coordination increased as well. The response was greater systemization and rationalization of production, culminating in the concept of scientific management (Taylor, 1911). Taylor (1911) recommended the creation a planning department and a centralized unit to create rules and procedures and to maintain records thus resulting in the first specialized staff function. Jamrog et al. (2004) point out that Taylor (1911) is best known for time and motion studies, he also put forth three important concepts that provided the foundation for modern HR profession; that individuals selected to do the work should be as perfectly matched as possible and overqualified individuals should be eliminated, that employees should be trained carefully to perform the work exactly as specified and should not work at a pace detrimental to their health and finally that there should be incentives for employees to follow the detailed procedures (P. 53). Scientific management is one of the early footholds of contemporary HR.

According to Jamrog & Overholt (2004), out of the industrial revolution came the birth of labor unions, the Civil Service Commission, the industrial welfare movement and groundbreaking research in scientific management and industrial psychology. All this lead to the development of the first personnel departments in the 1920's (P. 52). The field of human relations, or industrial and personnel relations that emerged in the 1920s provided a new focus for the profession. In an effort to increase productivity, personnel programs expanded to include medical aid and sick benefits, vaccinations, holidays, housing allowances and other new benefits. New personnel roles emerged as unions began challenging the fairness and validity of Taylor's scientific management theories. The human relations movement provided new insights derived from studies that linked improved productivity to management philosophies emphasizing employee communications, cooperation and involvement. This new thinking about employee

cooperation grew from the works of Elton Mayo-known as the Father of Human Relations, and from the Hawthorne Studies, an important series of illumination experiments conducted between 1924 and 1932. Conducted at the Hawthorne Works of AT&T's Western Electric Plant near Chicago, the Hawthorne Studies were the first to question Taylorism's behavioral assumptions. Mayo, who conducted the studies to explore how changes in working environments affected productivity, was surprised by the results. Although the study began as an effort to quantify the levels of lighting and other physical conditions that would maximize employee productivity, Mayo and his researchers soon found a much greater link between employee productivity and the level of attention managers paid to employees and their behavior. The studies concluded that, in motivating workers, human factors were often more important than physical conditions. For the first time, productivity research put forth the controversial proposition that workers' feelings were important. Mayo's work propelled further developments in HR management (Losey, 1998). Along with scientific management, welfare work, and vocational guidance came into favor and influenced the nature of early HR and serve as foundations on which contemporary HR was built (Ogilvie et al., 2003, p. 257).

The staffing function grew in influence as it was seen as a way to eliminate the oppressive control and power of the foreman and to implement fairer, more consistent treatment of workers. Having gained a foothold in organizations, HR began to expand its boundaries and increase its power fueled by wars, national legislation and economic cycles. Entry into World War I only exasperated an already tight labor market forcing a renewed emphasis on hiring and employment. Losey (1998) explains that after WWII the nation's economic draught ended and placed the focus on full employment again creating a labor shortage. Expanding job growth meant expanded roles for the personnel manager including recruiting, testing, training,

mediating, and keeping an eye on employee morale and production efficiency. During and after both World Wars the federal government intervened in labor and employment relations by standardizing work arrangement, stabilizing wage rates, and institutionalizing seniority provisions. Government controls led directly to the growth of HR staff (Ogilvie et al., 2003, p. 262). The passage of the National Labor Relations Act in 1935 signaled a change in the federal government's role in labor-management relations. As employers began to understand the need for professionals to play a mediating role between employer and employee, HR, in the form of personnel managers, emerged (Losey, 1998). Both civil rights legislation (i.e. Civil Rights Act of 1964) and workplace environment laws (i.e. Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970) created new regulations and drove HR growth. HR's job now shifted focus from protecting employees from supervisors (foremen), to protecting the organization. With the passage of so many employment laws and regulations, the troublesome actions of managers needed to be controlled and changed in order to limit organizational liability. Fueling continued growth, specialized roles were added to the HR domain (Ogilvie et al., 2003, p. 263).

Strategic human resources.

In the 1970's HR experienced another refocusing when strategic human resource management (SHRM) began to emerge. SHRM called for the alignment of strategy, organizational structure and human resource strategy. Linking HR activities with organizational strategy had a dramatic impact, shifting the focus of HR away from tactical and operational activities. The power of human resource management has begun to extend beyond the domain of human resource departments. Organizations have recognized the importance of human resource considerations in long-range strategic planning. The 1980's saw a shift away from union rights coupled with significant legislative changes (COBRA, WARN Act) and judicial decisions

(*Meritor v. Vinson*, inclusion of sexual harassment under Title VII) increasing the rights of employees which shaped the role and responsibilities of HR for years to come. For Valentino et al. (2013), HR prior to the 1980's was nothing more than a bunch of paper pushers. Jamrog & Overholt (2004) describe the personnel profession as "little more than a glorified file clerk who planned the company picnic" (p. 52). The personnel departments of the 1980's gave way to human resources as a strategic partner with HR managers today responsible to develop strategic solutions to employment-related issues effecting productivity and performance all the while complying with the law and avoiding legal liability (p. 33). During the 1990's new compliance requirements under several important pieces of federal legislation moved HR into a managerial role which included not only navigating new legal requirements, but also educating management regarding the obligations created by the new statutes (Valentino et al., 2013, p. 36).

As HR grew in its strategic role, it became aligned with business goals and management interests positioning itself to provide as Ogilvie et al. (2003) put it, "visionary leadership and advocacy for transformative change" (p. 265). Traditional HR was involved in helping to create or improve the degree of fit between and among the work, the worker, the supervisor and the organization. In the aforementioned strategic era, HR broadened its perspective to include larger notions of fit and moved HR closer to management interests, some would say at the expense of the worker. Throughout its history HR has shifted focus, dealing with the interests and issues of different constituencies, as pressure sources changed. It pragmatically aligned with different groups and dealt with different concerns as they arose over time (Ogilvie et al., 2003) and developed a tension between the role of "employee advocate" and "business leader" (Vosburgh, 2007). HR was asked to wear many hats, serving the needs of the business while serving the needs of the employees. According to Vosburgh (2007) the boom and bust economic history of

the last 20 plus years has formed in large part what HR was asked to support. The HR function went from being challenged with creative recruitment, retention, and compensation strategies during boom times to being challenged with creative restructuring, downsizing, and outplacement during bust times and in the latest wave of mergers and acquisitions. The HR priorities during these “bust” times were not conducive to discussions of talent and hot spots: They were more about survival and cost-cutting efficiencies (p. 14). Others agree (Valentino et al., 2013) with the idea of the constantly changing face of HR citing changes in societal values and workplace demographics as major drivers of change in US employment and employment laws over the past 30 years.

Ulrich (1997) lead the charge in writing about and demonstrating the need for HR to become a strategic business partner, seeing the need for HR to become a more powerful influence in companies as human capital becomes the key differentiator. Ulrich in his 1997 book *Human Resource Champions* offers the most widely accepted model for modern HR. Ulrich (1997) presents a simple 2x2 model, in which the horizontal axis is a focus on either process or people and the vertical axis is a day-to-day operational focus or a future-strategic focus. In the lower left quadrant (process and operational focus) is the administrative expert role; in the lower right quadrant (people and operational focus) is the employee relations expert role; in the upper left (process and strategic focus) is the strategic partner role; and in the upper right (people and strategic focus) is the change agent role. Vosburgh (2007) extends the Ulrich (1995) model by adding sixteen accountabilities for which HR is held responsible: strategic HR planning, HR as business partner, culture and image, staffing and talent management, organizational design, survey action planning, performance management, training and development, employee relations, labor relations, safety and worker’s compensation, diversity and equal employment

opportunity, compensation, benefits, HR information systems, and compliance. He places the sixteen accountabilities on a graph in which the horizontal axis is time (over the last 100 years) and the vertical axis represents HR's impact on or contribution to the business, from limiting liability and protecting against the downside of usually legally mandated things, up to adding value and maximizing the upside of a strategically differentiated employment proposition (p. 15). Over the 100 year time frame Vosburgh (2007) uses, the name of the function has evolved in step with the kinds of accountabilities expected; labor relations to employee relations to personnel to human resources ending with organizational effectiveness. Today it is a world of AND: Having to do the lower-left legally required transactional parts AND the upper-right value-added transformational parts of HR. The lower-left accountabilities tend to be the "hygiene factors" that if done perfectly are not noticed, but if messed up will attract a lot of attention, accountabilities such as labor/union relations, safety and worker's compensation, employee relations, benefits, compliance, and compensation. In contrast, the upper-right accountabilities tend to be the ones that when done well give the organization a great strategic advantage, accountabilities including strategic HR, organizational design, HR as business partner, diversity and equal employment opportunity, and culture and image. The "lower left" content represents important technical expertise that often can be delivered in transactional kinds of ways. The "upper right" content also requires technical expertise, but can be delivered only if the HR professional has established a level of internal consulting skills and personal credibility (p. 15). Jay Jamrog and Miles Overholt (2004) came to a similar conclusion in their article "*Building a Strategic HR Function*" that for HR to continue to evolve there needs to be more emphasis on human capital as a differentiator. Similarly, Ed Gubman (2004) added his parallel thoughts in his article "*HR Strategy and Planning: From Birth to Business Results*" by stating

that HR must start measuring their impact on business outcomes with a greater focus on customer and market growth. Today, the human resource professional is charged with optimizing employee skills, matching people to jobs and maximizing the potential of employees as valuable resources (Losey, 1998). Research conducted by Ed Lawler and Sue Mohrman supports the idea of HR continuing to be an essential element in organizations in the new marketplace. “When organizations have a strategy that focuses on knowledge and information, HR is much more likely to be a full strategic partner. Knowledge and information strategies inevitably lead to a focus on human capital and the degree to which the company possesses the knowledge and information it needs in order to implement the strategy” (Lawler & Mohrman, 2003). The evolution of the discipline and profession of human resources has been a long process inextricably tied to market conditions and business conditions, and one that will continue indefinitely.

A resource based view of an organization.

The fundamental shift in HR from a tactical to strategic discipline has been explained above. An important aspect of this transformation or evolution has been left unmentioned, that is the necessity of an organization to have a resource based view (RBV) in which the “resources” of an organization, including human ones, are what determine an organization’s strategies and ultimately its success. From the perspective of a RBV, human resources are strategic to the optimal operation of the organization (Wright et al., 1994). According to Barney (1991) and Gong et al. (2009), RBV posits that valuable and firm specific human resource practices promote firm performance through retaining, motivating, empowering, and developing employees. If we use RBV as a theoretical framework to explain why human resource practices can favorably influence organizational performance we see that human resource management

practices are heterogeneous in nature and not perfectly mobile, and, therefore, neither perfectly imitable nor substitutable without great effort (Barney, 1991; Wright et al., 2001). This theoretical framework proposes that high-performance human resource practices that provide value to the organization, and are frequently unique, causally ambiguous, and hardly imitable build and sustain employee-based capabilities. The RBV stands in contrast to the market based view (MBV) which is an outside in approach to competitive strategy and copes with competition through astute market positioning. In other words, firms identify the opportunities and threats in their external environment and upon mapping out the various opportunities and threats from outside and having a good understanding of the behavior and current external situations, the firm then proceeds to make necessary adjustments internally so that it fits to its external environment. Unlike the RBV, the MBV does not take into account the internal capabilities and differentiators that an organizations possesses, namely its human resources. Coming from a RBV perspective, Wright et al. (2001) believe that people management systems might play a role in creating cultures or mindsets that enable the maintenance of unique competencies. Or, that people systems may promote and maintain socially complex relationships characterized by trust, knowledge sharing, and teamwork. Finally, that people systems might have resulted in the creation of a high quality human capital pool that cannot be easily imitated because of time compression diseconomies. The RVB provides a broader foundation for exploring the impact of HR on strategic resources. In this context, HR is not limited to its direct effects on employee skills and behavior. Its effects are more encompassing in that they help weave those skills and behaviors within the broader fabric of organizational processes, systems and, ultimately, competencies (p. 709-710).

Organizational Culture

HR plays a prominent role in the success of an organization, particularly as it pertains to a creating sustainable competitive advantage by way of human capital accumulation as well as creation, maintenance and protection of organizational culture.

My experience in Human Resources has given me the unique perspective on organizational communication seen through the lens of organizational/corporate culture. I take the perspective that organizational communication defines and is defined by organizational culture. In making this statement I wish to explore the co-dependent and symbiotic relationship that exists between organizational communication and organizational culture. Communication within an organization emanates from and is shaped by the predominant culture of the organization. Individuals are the epicenter of the communicative process as well as the carriers and molders of culture. Organizations are made up of a group of individuals, individuals that carry with them certain qualities and tendencies which are the very definers of culture. Culture comes from the shared experiences of the group of individuals who make up the organization. Organizations use communication to help shape their culture and define for the group what is important and desirable, what are the goods worthy of pursuit. In that way, communication is a method of shaping culture. As the group of individuals come into its own and creates for itself shared meanings, it shapes the very communicative process. The relationships are independent while at the same time interdependent. Does the organization communicate by e-mail or written memo? Does the leadership of an organization hold face-to-face meetings with its workers or do they avoid contact with subordinates? Do workers feel that they are able to talk to their managers or are they afraid of their bosses? Questions like these define not only the style of communication but also the type of individual who populates the organization. Culture is a self-

regenerating entity that feeds off of itself. It is, however, dependent on the individuals to accept it and carry it forward. In that way, culture defines the communicative process while at the same time being defined by the individuals upon whom it relies.

We must first look at the concept and phenomenon of organizational culture. It is important to note that culture has not always been an accepted, or even recognized, aspect of organizations. The very use of the culture metaphor displays our concern for relations with others, a need to understand the context of communication and desire to identify stable organizational habits and practices. It speaks loudly about our need for closure and our dislike for ambiguity (Eisenburg & Riley, 2001). Early scholars like Lewin, Lippitt and White in the late 1930's recognized group norms and climate as important elements of organizations. Throughout the 1960's and 70's numerous scholars like Hellriegel & Slocum, A.P. Jones and James, Litwin & Stringer, Schneider and Tagiuri & Litwin all explored and dealt with the issue of "climate" in organizations and failed to get beneath the surface to the causal aspects of how organizations function (Schein, 1990). Katz and Kahn (1966, 1978), using systems theory and systems dynamics, made significant strides toward developing a theoretical foundation for culture studies. Later in the 1980's scholars like Ouchi and Pascal & Athos endeavored to understand why U.S. companies were routinely outperformed by companies in other societies. Looking to explain major differences in organizational performance and effectiveness within a society, culture provided the needed concept (Schein, 1990, p. 109). From the early 1980's forward, communication processes were recast as the way organizations were constructed, maintained and transformed leading to communication's constitutive role in creating organizational culture to be identified (Eisenburg & Riley, 2001). Schein (1990) describes the major research streams in organizational culture which still serve to inform how culture is

perceived. Survey research views culture as the property of groups and measured via questionnaires. Analytical descriptive research views culture as a concept for which empirical measure must be developed. Ethnographic research uses methods developed in sociology and anthropology to study culture. Clinical descriptive research comes from insights gained by organizational consultants through their opportunity to observe phenomena occurring at the source, at higher management levels where policies originate (p. 110). Martin (1992) broke organizational culture into three perspectives; the integrated or unified perspective which examines areas of consensus and consistency with a focus values and beliefs embraced by nearly all organizational members, the differentiated perspective which focuses on inconsistencies resulting in subcultures within an umbrella culture, and the fragmented perspective which focuses on culture as being complex and filled with ambiguities (Kramer, 2010, p. 103). It is important to remember that organizations exist within a context of a larger national culture which exerts influence. Kramer (2010) points out that according to Hofstede (2010) national culture can be described along four primary dimensions: (1) individualism versus collectivism which describes the degree to which the culture focuses on individual rather than group needs and accomplishment; (2) masculinity versus femininity which indicates whether or not the culture emphasizes traditional gender roles and the separation between work and non-work; (3) power distance which relates to whether the culture accepts and emphasizes status differences and the resulting inequities; (4) uncertainty avoidance which describes whether the culture encourages information sharing to avoid uncertainty or tolerates ambiguity (p. 117).

Constitutive perspective.

Ashcraft et al. (2009) reviewed the constitutive view of communication, which assumes the communication is “a central organizing process that manages the intersection of symbolic

and material worlds” – that “communication generates, not merely expresses, key organizational realities” (p.2). This perspective captures the power of communication process in organizational contexts, reflecting social theory’s linguistic turn, which identified language as a producer rather than reflector of realities in the social world (Rorty, 1967, as cited in Ashcraft et al., 2009).

Language is an ontological condition of human experience, inherently tied to human being, and communication is the constructive vehicle of the work of language; communication creates social realities (Searle, 1995, as cited in Ashcraft et al., 2009). For Ashcraft et al., communication puts abstract structures in organizational settings “into live motion”, manifesting the joint production, among and between organizational members, of the organization itself, from the relationships and organizational structures to organizational culture and climate. Communication creates the realities of organizational life (p. 4). The gradual shaping of an organization’s culture and climate takes place over time as the communicative practices form and reform the patterned structures of interaction, shaping expectations for behavior and sedimenting those increasingly regular patterns.

Communicative perspective.

As we look at a communicative perspective on culture we see culture defined as the patters of human action and its recursive behaviors, including talk and its symbolic residues, and meaning (Eisenberg & Riley, 2001). Eisenberg & Riley (2001) explain the communicative perspective of organizational culture as having several important presuppositions; it acknowledges the symbolic character or ordinary language and the ways in which cultural meanings are co-constructed in everyday conversations, it sees communication as an interactive prism through which all potentially enabling and constraining forces must pass with each instance of communication being a kind of crucible for culture, it takes into account the broader

patters of communication in society and examines how they appear and interact at the organizational level, it takes full advantage of various roles for the researcher, and finally it acknowledges numerous motives for studying culture (p. 295). Smircich (1983) defined culture as a social or normative glue that hold organizations together and expresses the values or social ideals and beliefs the organizational members share which are manifested in numerous ways; myths, rituals, stories, legends and specialized language. Considering culture as an internal variable to an organization focuses on how it can be shaped and changed to match managerial needs (pp. 344-345). The concept of culture came out of the inadequacy of the study of organizational climate and norms. It is sometimes difficult to define due to the different ways in which an organization responds to lived experience. Schein (1990) asserts that the development of culture is simultaneously a behavioral, cognitive and an emotional process and the deepest level of culture will be the cognitive in that the perceptions, language and thought processes that a group comes to share will be the ultimate causal determinate of feelings, attitudes, espoused values, and overt behaviors . As we look at an organization as a group, it must be acknowledged that there can and are subgroups within the larger structure. Any definable group with a shared history can have its own culture. This being the case, there is the potential for subgroups to have culture that are in contrast and even opposition to the overall organizational culture (p. 111). Smircich (1983) agrees, “Much of the literature refers to *an* organizational culture, appearing to lose sight of the great likelihood that there are multiple organizational subcultures, or even countercultures completing to define the nature of situations within the organizational boundaries” (p. 346).

Culture as an ordered system.

Corman and Poole (2000) offer a definition of culture as an ordered system of meanings and symbols shared during the process of communication. It is an emergent property of the interaction of a group, best represented by a measure of central tendency. Schein (1991) provides a good working definition of culture as a pattern of basic assumptions invented, discovered or developed by a given group as it learns to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore is to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems (p. 247). He goes on to describe culture as having 3 levels; observable artifacts, values and basic underlying assumptions. Artifacts are those things commonly considered when one mentions culture such as physical layout, dress code, the manner in which people address each other, the smell and feel of the place as well as other physical items such as records, products, statements of philosophy and annual reports. Values as well as norms, ideologies, charters and philosophies are those things that can be empirically studied. Underlying assumptions are those things that are taken-for-granted, underlying and usually unconscious and which determine perceptions, thought processes, feelings and behaviors (p. 111). Martin (1992) offers her conceptualization that each organizational culture is a nexus, or a site at which cultural forces such as practices, assumptions, values and interpretations, interact. Fritz (2013) offers a complementary view stating that organizational climate and culture take shape over time as communicative practices form and reform the patterned structure of interaction, shaping expectations for behavior and sedimenting those increasingly regular patterns (p. 115). The regular patterns of behavior become, over time, an expected and normal part of the organization, its culture. Everyday behavior within organizations becomes

completely unreflective and only noticed when violations occur or when conditions change and normal practices no longer work (Arnett, Fritz & Bell, 2009). In Arnett's terms, unreflective practices become the "common sense" that guides behavior in culture and relationships (Arnett et al., 2009). Another contributing force to the creation of organizational culture comes from occupational cultures. Individuals learn early on what occupational norms exist and continue to learn their occupational culture throughout their career from peers within the organization as well as from peers in other organizations (Kramer, 2010, p. 120).

Social constructionist perspective.

Looking back at Weick (1976, 1995), relationships shape the larger social system environment, which feed back to the relational level through continued and dynamic communication processes that defines organizing. Organizational members give meaning to what happens in organizational life through communicative action. Communication both reveals and conditions values through language thus contributing to identities of organizational participants as well as the climate and culture. Culture resides at the organizational level (Moch & Fields, 1985). As events occur in the life of the organization, members interpret these events in light of the organizational culture imparted to them during their organizational socialization. The imparted, and now shared, culture serves as a version of what ought to be and provides boundaries of acceptable norms (Arnett & Arneson, 1999). Organizations, according to Schein (1990), face challenges from both the internal as well as external environments which help shape its culture. Internally, organizations must develop consensus on; the core mission, functions and primary tasks of the organizations, the specific goals to be pursued, the basic means to be used to accomplish the goals, the criteria to be used for measuring results and the remedial or repair strategies to be used if original goals are not achieved. Externally, organizations must develop

consensus on; the common language and conceptual system to be used, the group boundaries and criteria for inclusion, the criteria for allocation of status, power and authority, the criteria for intimacy, friendship and love in work and family settings, the criteria for the allocation of rewards and punishments and the concepts for managing things like ideology and religion (p. 113). Hofstede (2010) maintains that it is the shared perceptions of daily work practices, and not shared values or beliefs, which are key to an organization's culture. Culture is created as a result of lived organizational experiences and the experiences of the individual agents which make up the organization. As organizations respond and adapt to internal and external forces, the decisions made create a shared set of beliefs, and common understanding of how things work. Looking back at Google, it is easy to see how the founders worked very hard shape an organizational culture that reflected how the company came to be, and also "who" the founders wanted the company to become. Culture is learned from the experiences surrounding a critical incident and/or through identification with leaders. Norms are created as a result of dealing with and responding to important or stressful situations. Leaders serve as models for expected and acceptable behavior. Employees identify with strong central figures, such as founders or a C.E.O. and internalize their beliefs, values and assumptions (Schein, 1990, p. 115). Culture, in any of its meanings, is a property of a human group (Schein, 1991, p. 247).

Schein (1990) describes the elements which make up culture as seven-fold; 1 the organization's relationship to its environment; does the organization perceive itself to be dominant, submissive, harmonizing or searching out a niche?, 2 the nature of human activity; is the correct way for humans to behave to be dominant/pro-active, harmonizing or passive/fatalistic?, 3 the nature of reality and truth; how do we define what is true and what is not true?, 4 the nature of time: what is the basic orientation in terms of past, present and future and

what kind of time unit is most relevant for the conduct of daily life?, 5 the nature of human nature; are humans basically good, neutral or evil and is human nature perfectible or fixed?, 6 the nature of human relationships; what is the correct way for people to relate to each other? and 7 homogeneity versus diversity; is the group best off if it's highly diversity or highly homogeneous and should group members conform or innovate? The answers to the questions posed by the underlying dimensions help us to flesh out culture (p. 114). Validation, and thusly culture, occurs both externally and internally. Externally, validation is measured by success in task accomplishment. Internal validation happens when anxiety associated with meaninglessness and unpredictability is reduced (Schein, 1991, p. 250).

Human resource and culture connection.

It is important to connect human resources with the concept of culture. Culture as discussed earlier, has many definitions from which to choose. I prefer the definition of culture provided by Schein (1991); "a pattern of basic assumptions invented, discovered or developed by a given group as it learns to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore is to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems" (P. 247). As HR has grown and developed one of the primary accountabilities (Vosburgh, 2007) it has added is responsibility for the culture and image of the organization. Human resources has become the stewards of organizational culture and internal brand imaging. Frequently understood as a "multi-layered" phenomenon (Sathe, 1983), organizational culture includes deep seated and enduring values, at the most fundamental or inner level, with artefacts and symbols, procedures and arrangements, shared doings and sayings (Sathe, 1983) characterizing the outer and more superficial layers of organizational culture. Some doubt that an organization can

influence the substantive content of its own culture, because the underlying values of any organizational culture are deeply rooted in broader national, racial and religious cultures (Schein, 1983). More amenable to molding by management are the outer layers of culture, the rituals, symbols, heroes and other artefacts, all of which fall under human resources. HR is responsible for protecting and promoting a certain kind of good (Arnett, 2009) which becomes the very fabric of organizational culture. Values, behaviors, and management practices, including human resource management practices, tend to be closely connected (Florea et al., 2013). Perhaps the best way to illustrate the connection between culture and human resources is by way of an example. If altruism is kept in high regard as indicated by management behavior and codified in an employer's code of conduct (which HR writes, maintains and updates), then employees are likely to be concerned about others, in addition to their self-interest. This value is likely to influence their work behavior, directing their efforts toward organizational citizenship behavior and a genuine concern for organizational stakeholders. Following from this value policies and procedures are developed that serve to validate behaviors in which generosity, mutual support, long-term interests, and collective success are demonstrated. Those actions which revolve around individual, short-term, objectives are discouraged. Infractions of the code of conduct or established policies or procedures will be dealt with by way of a corrective action process. The rapid response and severity of the discipline meted out also serves to reinforce the importance of altruism as an organizational norm. Performance management will be developed to hold each employee accountable to achieving or demonstrating altruism by creating specific goals and objectives in support of it. Florea et al. (2013) state it very clearly, "Employees' values captured in organizational culture influence, and can be influenced by, human resource management

practices... Organizational practices that are applied consistently reinforce values, as a result of shaping and enhancing interpersonal relationships within the organization” (P. 398).

Organizational Communication

Moving to a look at how organizational communication has come into its own through the contributions of some of the major figures who offered advancements through their scholarly examination, we will gain insight into the discipline which is an integral part of culture creation. In the *Communication Yearbook (2001)*, Taylor, Flanagin, Cheney and Seibold lay out a nice discussion of the 3 eras of organizational communication development offered by Redding and Tompkins. They label them the era of preparation (1900-1940) in which the emphasis was primarily on communication skills training, the era of identification and consolidation (1940-1970) in which the emergence of the discipline saw its greatest leap forward and the era of maturity and innovation (after 1970) in which great efforts were made to the theoretical premises and philosophical bases of the field.

Frederick Taylor is perhaps the seminal figure in the advancement of the study of organizations. His thoughts in *Principals of Scientific Management (1911)* laid the foundation for all studies into the workings of modern organizations. Taylors ideas where bore out of a need to solve manufacturing deficiencies and resulted in a 2-tier system; managements studies the individual elements of a job and develops minimum standards of production and the implementation of a differential rate system of piece work in which the laborers are paid a low wage for normal production and a higher rate for production above minimal. His objectives were attainable only if the organization followed a few simple principles; each person should have a clearly define daily task that is sufficiently large that it is not easily accomplished, workers should be provided standard conditions and appliances to complete the job, and workers should

receive a high pay for success and suffer negative consequences for failure. Implicit in these steps and his entire system, is the need for a well-developed system of organizational communication. If workers are to understand what the piece work standards are and what the results are for success as well as failure, there must be a well-established and functional system of communication to disseminate information down to the lowest laborer.

Max Weber (1947) was interested in the organization as a tool to prove is foundational questions about non-coerced obedience. One of main themes for Weber was the idea of authority. He relates this to organizations in the different types of leaders and resulting systems that are present. Every system is based on the group's willingness to obey. Weber (1947) states that in order for obedience to be maintained there must be the application and enforcement of the order. He describes culture as the conflict relationship between chiefs (those in authority) and their administrative staffs for appropriation, misuse, either legally for the public good or illegally, by theft or fraud, appropriate levels of power and rewards. Another major concern for Weber is the idea of appropriation. By this he means the closure that takes place in some social relationships and ends with the exclusion of others from the collective. He looks at the structure of social systems, of which an organization is one, and recognizes that consequences grow organically out of the structure itself. For Weber, two types of meaning exist. The first is concrete existing meaning held by an individual or the approximation of the meaning held by a collective. The second is a theoretical or pure type (Weber, 1947).

Charles Redding conducted and directed quantitative investigations designed to inform and improve organizational and business practice, while embracing a critical-interpretive frame that interrogated the search for generalized results in businesses (Buzzanelli & Stohl, 1999). Redding's early work took place at a time when greater legitimacy was given to liberal arts, such

as communication. His later research reflected the critiques and epistemological shifts in the field. Buzzanelli & Stohl (1999) described the four major themes of Redding's work; (a) human progress through empirical investigations; (b) the power of critique; (c) message exchange as the core of organizational communication; (d) the need to understand the socio-historical and diverse theoretical underpinnings of the field. His influence extends through his colleague P.K.

Redding, Linda Putnam and former graduate advisee Fred Jablin.

Maslow's (1943) hierarchy of needs was an important theory which helped inform scholars and laypersons alike on the factors which motivate the individual. His theory is often described in terms of a series of human needs arranged in the form of a triangle with several ascending levels. This five stage model can be divided into basic (or deficiency) needs (e.g. physiological, safety, love, and esteem) and growth needs (self-actualization). The deficiency, or basic needs, are said to motivate people when they are unmet and the need to fulfil such needs will become stronger the longer the duration they are denied. For example, the longer a person goes without food the more hungry they will become. One must satisfy lower level basic needs before progressing on to meet higher level growth needs. Once these needs have been reasonably satisfied, one may be able to reach the highest level called self-actualization. Every person is capable and has the desire to move up the hierarchy toward a level of self-actualization.

His theory influenced subsequent theories in advertising, marketing, management and human resources. Although influential, I take the same position as Thames in that Maslow is a closet Aristotelean. Maslow's (1943) uses the term self-actualization without ever defining what the term means and how a person gets there. Thames describes Maslow as failing to have an "embryonic or seminal self" to be actualized instead seeing the individual self as a creative choice with the ultimate characteristic of self-actualization being creativity (p. 2). Maslow does

provide a list of what he sees as the observable characteristics. The problem is that he never explains how one is able to determine when a person is self-actualized. Although Aristotle provides a formal and material cause and efficient and final cause as an explanation for how an organism develops along a hierarchical continuum, Maslow never gives a cause for the correlations he labels as actualizations (Thames, p. 4). Aristotle used the term *entelechia* to talk about nature of thing to actualize into what it potentially is. Maslow never gives an account of how the acorn becomes the oak or how one can determine if and when the acorn has self-actualized. Thames states it this way, “Maslow presupposes that which he would determine by induction, then refuses to leap inductively to what he has already presupposed – generalizations that would constitute claims about the nature of self-actualization.” He [Maslow] gives no account out of what potential or potentials individuals are actualized (p. 4). Maslow’s hierarchy of needs, despite its flaws discussed above, continues to be a staple in the field of human resource management.

Now that we have a solid understanding of what culture is and how it factors into corporate communication as well as the pivotal figures in the development of the field of organizational communication, a review of the major paradigms/approaches that constitute the discipline will lead us further towards making a connection to culture.

Major paradigms.

Classical organizational communication theory centers on the hierarchical aspects of an organization. It looked at the messages, channels and media used inside businesses. (May & Mumby, 2005) For Taylor (1993), classical communication theory is built on a network metaphor, composed of nodes (people/communicators) and links (message/communications). Information is perceived to be stored and shipped, within a structure whose existence is

presupposed. Communication is a process of transmission, both data and knowledge/understanding and not a structuring process. Communication occurs in organizations, a function, rather than something that which occurs in an organization. Classical theory uses Weber's (1947) idea of normalization of the communication situation, both with respect to relations among employees and relations between employees and the public (Taylor, 1993). Taylor (1993) continues by explaining that normalization under classical theory the communication is accomplished by varying means all with the intention of stripping communication of its personal flavor by way of a set pattern of interactional routines ultimately reaching total uniformity to the exclusion of group process, which is thought of as noise.

Modernism as an organizational communication approach favors centralized authority and hierarchy, mass markets, consistent goals and predictable strategies. It works best in bureaucratic structures that formalize roles, rules and procedures, differentiation of units, identities and functions. It tends to standardized systems of reward and punishment tied to job descriptions and performance contracts. Organizations in this approach foster employee conformity to goals and policies, unity and similarity. They utilize technologies designed for routine, mass production with coherent cultures grounded in stability, tradition and custom. (May & Mumby, 2005)

Post Modernism is used as an umbrella term and therefore is difficult to define. When someone speaks of postmodernism they are concerned with exploring the complex relationships of power, knowledge, and discourse created in the struggle between social groups. It joins with other perspectives that challenge the conduct of business as usual Post modernism favors decentralized authority, lateral relationships within and between units and localized autonomy in employee decision making, fragmented (niche) markets, evolving goals and improvised

strategies, democratic processes that are informal, emergent and based on consensus, de-differentiation of units, identities and functions, general and continuous empowerment enabling employees to be proactive and anticipate and respond to change, complex, negotiated relationships in which employees cultivate dedication, reflexivity and creativity in the service of organizational performance (May & Mumby, 2005). Postmodern organizations consider diversity and difference as resources for increasing useful knowledge and effective performance. They employ sensitive and interactive technologies enabling customized, certified production, agile cultures that unfold dynamically in conditions of paradox and uncertainty. Postmodernists take discourse to be central and primary to all organizational processes and believe that all human understandings and relationships are constituted and mediated by language. They believe that human experience is never direct, pure or immediate. They study how the distinction between the relative power of groups is produced in and through discourse. Organizational knowledge is a central, normalized practice through which particular groups establish their authority and legitimacy over other groups. Meaning is never universal, total, neutral or permanent (May & Mumby, 2005).

Critical organizational communication theory is interested in issues of power/authority, hierarchy, domination/subordination. Critical researchers see organizations as social historical creations accomplished in conditions of struggle and power relations. Critical research focuses on producing dis-census and providing a forum for and models of discussion to aid in the building of a more open consensus. It is concerned with false consciousness, consent, systematically distorted communication, routines and normalizations that produce partial interests and keep people from understanding and acting on their own interests. The central goal of critical approach to organizational communication has been to create a society and workplaces

that are free from dominion and where all members can contribute equally to produce systems that meet the needs and lead to the progressive development of all (Jablin & Putnam, 2001). May and Mumby (2005) describe critical theory as that which encourages the exploration of alternative communication practices that allow greater democracy and more creative and productive cooperation among stakeholders through reconsidering organizational governance and decision making processes. Critical studies has a broad meaning which includes works taking a critical or radical stance on contemporary society with an orientation toward investigating exploitation, repression, social justice, asymmetrical power relations, distorted communication and misrecognition of interests. Critical theory asks for a personal courage to identify and challenge assumptions behind ordinary ways of perceiving, conceiving, and acting, and for recognition of the influence of history, culture and social positioning on perceptions, meanings and actions. It has an activist dimension (May & Mumby, 2005).

In systems theory everything is seen in light of internal structures. According to Jablin & Putnam (2001) a systems approach to organizational communication is concerned with the search for order and regularity with an emphasis on holism over atomism and dynamic mutual causality over law like unidirectional causality. The focus is on the deep processes of transformation that produce and interpret overt patterns of behavior; the process of organizing rather than organizations.

Human Relations/Human Resources theory grew out of the research of Elton Mayo (1930) and his associates at the Harvard Business School. The new paradigm challenged the prevailing ideas of the time which were focused on the behaviors of individuals in industrial settings. The new theory made several assertions which set it apart and established its focus as being on the relations between individuals. Mayo's theory asserted that the economic incentive

is not the only motivating force. He noted that individuals will hold back on production, even when on piece work with the potential to make more money for increased production. The individual's performance is affected by his relationship with other workers as well as influences inside and outside of the workplace. Mayo (1930) held that workers do not respond well to being isolated and prefers to be part of a work group with fact-to-face interaction with peers. When working together, workers develop an informal organization that may or may not follow the same lines as the larger organization. Continuing to depart from traditional thinking of the time, Mayo felt that extreme functional specialization did not create the most effective organization. Workers did not suffer from, and even benefitted from, job enlargement where they were given the opportunity to do different jobs. Psychological contract theory is another important concept in the larger field of human resource management theory. Psychological contract theory acknowledges that the economic and formal aspects of employment are influenced by informal social interactions and recognizes that managing people contains a strong social dynamic (Cullinane et al., 2006, p. 115). The idea is that relationships between employee and employer are complex and are defined as much by social interaction as by economic forces. Social constructionism offers some additional insight into the culture focused view espoused by human resource management. Stead (2004), taking a social constructionist perspective on culture, believes that social conventions and interpersonal relationships have cultural implications due to social constructionist's focus on relationships (p.391). "Relationships construct cultures and recursively cultures construct relationships" (Stead, 2004, p. 391). For Stead (2004), although cultures are created by social interactions between individuals in an organization, meanings differ across culture and contexts and are socially and culturally constructed. From a social constructionist perspective culture may be viewed as a social system

of shared symbols, meanings, perspectives, and social actions that are mutually negotiated by people in their relationships with others (p. 391).

Applying a cultural perspective.

Going back to my earlier assertion that organizational communication defines and is defined by culture, I will look at the major paradigms in light of the cultural perspective to show how each has aspects that lend themselves to a people-centered view of communication in organizations. May and Mumby (2005) offer a few assumptions relative to a culture-centered view of organizational communication that I will use as a basis for discussion and application. Their assumptions are as follows:

- (1) There is a symbolic nature of ordinary language and the ways in which cultural meanings are co-constructed in everyday conversations, textual evidence of patterns and also the entire non-verbal, semiotic field. It is not limited to central metaphors and key stories.
- (2) Tension exists between cognitive and behavioral approaches to human action, through a focus on communicative praxis. Human communication is the action in which interpretation and action most clearly coexist. Communication can be seen as an interactive prism through which all potentially enabling and constraining forces must pass.
- (3) There are broader patterns of communication in society that show up in the organization.
- (4) They act as constraints on behavior and serve as identity resources for members.

Looking at Classical organizational communication theory in light of a culture centered perspective we can see there are connections to be made. Classical theory is concerned with the

organization's internal communication issues with little regard for the external influences. This being the case, the major channels through which communication disseminates is through its people by way of overly defined and regulated systems. The interaction of people and the environment existing within the organization are expressly what I refer to as constituting culture. The classical idea of organizational communication uses nodes or people and links or messages. The idea that communication occurs between people within the existing structure of an organization points directly to the influence of the organization's culture. The organization must foster the open exchange of data and/or knowledge in order for the process to operate effectively. Managers are positioned as the driving force behind communication and the employees are simply those that receive the message and carry out the orders. Referring back to Schein's (1990) definition of culture as *a pattern of basic assumptions invented, discovered or developed by a given group as it learns to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore is to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems*, we see the influence of culture in that it is the "correct way" he describes. Since it has been vetted and acknowledged as the best method, it becomes culture and a part of the collective organizational psyche. If we replace "culture" for "correct way" we see that culture becomes the method as well as the result of the process. It serves as not only the carrier but also the infrastructure which carries the message. It is the vehicle by which ideas, thoughts, identity and even temperament are transmitted.

Modern organizational communication theory is akin to classical theory in that its focus is on the hierarchy and issues of authority. The formalization of rules, roles and procedures coupled with the differentiation of units, identities and functions is a clear indicator of the

presence of cultural dynamics. In defining and framing all of these issues within an organization, you have created the framework for organizational culture. The modern view of organizational communication places an emphasis on the development of job descriptions and ties performance appraisals to performance, thus fostering the emergence of a corporate-wide cultural concern for performance (May & Mumby, 2005). Modern organizational communication theory intends to use the structures, policies and procedures to purposefully create a sense of stability, tradition and custom, which are the basic elements of culture. The idea of creating an overarching framework of policies and procedures relates directly to culture's emphasis on application of tested and effective methods for dealing with both external and internal issues. The idea is that individuals and groups of individuals are the main focus as well as users of the communicative processes with an organization.

Postmodern organizational theory is primarily concerned with exploring the complex relationships of power, knowledge, and discourse created in the struggle between social groups (May & Mumby, 2005). As mentioned earlier, it involves complex, negotiated relationships. Applying our 3 assumptions to this theory we see the centrality of discourse and the belief that all human understandings and relationships are constituted and mediated by language to be aligned with the concepts of culture. Culture can be seen in the importance assigned to the issue of power and authority in social groups. The idea that social groups struggle to define themselves, is indicative of the struggle for identification with the accepted corporate culture. Culture concerns itself with the application of tested strategies to deal with internal issues. As groups within the organization jockey for power positions, there is the creation of strategies and behaviors that are acceptable and preferred. This is the emergence of culture. As behaviors and strategies are tested and proven effective, they are adopted and become part of the culture as they

Eudaimonia: Using Aristotle to Inform Organizational Communication in Order to Reimagine Human Resource Management

are passed on and taught to later generations of workers. Post modernism deconstructs everything so that there is no ultimate meaning and concerns itself with the development of power through the discourse process. Culture plays an important role in the development of corporate power structures in that it sets the standards of what is and is not acceptable. Culture dictates for the organization what, at that moment in time, is the organization's appetite for certain behaviors and attitudes.

Critical organization communication theory has the central goal to create a society and workplaces that are free from dominion and where all members can contribute equally to produce systems that meet the needs and lead to the progressive development of all (Jablin & Putnam, 2001). Critical theory recognizes the influence of history, culture and social positioning on perceptions, meanings and actions. Critical theory not only recognizes the existence of culture, it embraces its influence. In looking at critical theory through the lens of culture, one sees the struggle of a group of individuals to overcome obstacles and how their application of successful strategies leads to a sense of corporate identity. In describing the emphases of critical theory, one sees all the various aspects of culture; artifacts, values and basic assumptions. The artifacts in this case are the systems present in the organization, the values being those that lead to the advancement of all. The basic assumptions being the belief that equality and democracy would lead to a better environment for everyone and that the current, prevailing system is broken and in need of modification.

Systems organizational theory focuses on the actual infrastructure and systems present within an organization. The focus is on the deep processes of transformation that produce and interpret overt patterns of behavior; the process of organizing rather than organizations (Jablin & Putnam, 2001). Looking at the systems approach we see the human element de-emphasized but

still present. The culture itself is technologically focused. Although culture draws from and is formed by communication in the organization, it can be directed toward an emphasis on technology as it is in the systems approach. Culture can be seen in the process of developing patterns of behavior. Culture, as the identity of the organization, is something that plays out in systems theory in the reliance upon the infrastructure and technology. How does culture inform my understanding of the systems approach? It allows me to see the emphasis on technology as nothing more than the organizations tried and tested strategy for dealing with their issues.

HR/Human Relations organizational theory focuses on the relations between individuals. The idea of culture shows up in HR/human relations theory in much the same way as the other approaches. It can be seen in the emphasis on interpersonal communication. It is also evident in the focus on individuals and their propensity to form sub-organizations within the larger organization that have their own set of beliefs, also known as a sub-culture. By implication, there must be a larger meta-culture, in order for there to be a sub-culture. HR/human relations theory placed a value on the idea of job enlargement and employee relatedness. These ostensibly become the very basis for organizational culture. Psychological contract theory provides insight into culture. The employment relationship takes the form of a psychological contract which describes the expectations of both the employee and employer (Mello, 2011). As the individuals in an organization interact through communicative acts, a culture is created as each party creates for themselves expectations of what the other will and will not do or provide. Traditionally, the psychological contract consisted for the employee of job security and opportunities for promotion with organizations expecting employees to contribute time, effort, skills, abilities, and loyalty. Employees now expect to take more responsibility for their own careers, from seeking training to balancing work and family (Mello, 2011). These expectations result in less job

security for employees, who can count on working for several companies over the course of a career. In exchange for top performance and working longer hours without job security, employees want companies to provide flexible work schedules, comfortable working conditions, more control over how they accomplish work, training and development opportunities, and financial incentives based on how the organization performs (Mello, 2011). The psychological contract remains an important element of the human resource perspective on culture despite having changed significantly as demographics and business conditions have shifted.

Culture can be seen in every aspect of organizational communication. Looking at culture as an ordered system of meanings and symbols shared during the process of communication (Corman & Poole, 2000), one can see how it makes itself present in every paradigm/approach. Organizational communication is, at its core, the process by which individuals within an organization communicate with one another as well as the external environment. This process as well as the resulting communication is what I am calling culture. It informs the entire organization on the parameters of what is acceptable. Within those parameters resides the communicative process. As organizational communication has evolved from a study of static communication through an organizational structure to a discipline interested in exploring the many facets of how an organization communicates externally as well as internally, culture has always played a pivotal role. Culture is always present, whether or not it is acknowledged or even utilized. Where there are groups of individuals working towards a common goal and living through that very experience, culture immerses. Culture is the “environment” from which communication flows and therefore shapes it. Having come from the environment, communication also serves to define the entity from which it flowed. An independent interdependent relationship.

Additional Perspectives

Professional civility.

The emerging discipline of Professional Civility, pioneered by Fritz (2013) provides insight into organizational culture from the perspective of interactions between individuals in an organizational setting. If organizations, as I have suggested, want to position themselves as a means for their employees to achieve and live a good life, fostering a culture of professional civility is essential.

Given that we spend a large portion of our waking lives at work, this is important research. Arnett, Fritz and Bell (2009) provide a background for Fritz's work by acknowledging how we spend a large portion of our lives in the company of other persons in the workplace and how when interactions are marked by rudeness and incivility, the quality of work life is diminished, compromising the "good" of organizations as dwelling places for shared constructive activity (p.2) In her book *Professional Civility; Communicative Virtue at Work* Fritz (2013) opens up with a discussion about the importance of how we interact with others, describing civility as an integral part of human flourishing, helping to define the good of and for human life (p. 3). Because organizations operate in a fractured world devoid of a common good, she quotes Arnett (1986) for clarification, "Organizations can no longer assume commonality of virtue structures embedding their participants; organizations need a common center and mission to anchor public agreement among diverse members" (p. 10). Looking to Aristotle (1999) for philosophical grounding, Fritz talks about how communicative interaction in the form of conversation in the workplace can be enacted with a degree of excellence described as *arête*; communication competence in professional interaction can be understood as communicative *phronesis*, or practical wisdom, pointing to the power of communicative activity to shape us and

the organizations in which we work (p. 13). She draws from McIntyre (2007) to assert that professional civility protects and promotes “goods”, defined as the intrinsic good of the human being, both individually and collectively (p. 14).

Fritz uses Kramer’s (2010) position on the importance of the initial stages of the socialization process as a launching point to emphasize how shared virtues are cultivated early on in an employee’s organizational life and thus help to define as well as construct organizational structure which she points out is consistent with the symbolic interactionist tradition (e.g., McCall & Simmons, 1978; Mead, 1936) which maintains that our social worlds as structured through interaction with others (p. 112). Fritz (2013) quotes Fairhurst (2004) as noting that “Systems emerge over repeated actions that evolve into multi-level orders of pattern” (p. 115). Arnett et al. (20009) remind us that unreflective practices are functional “common sense” that work to guide behavior, not only in cultures but in relationships as well (p. 115). Relationships shape the larger social system environment, which then feeds back to the relational level through continued and dynamic communication processes that define organizing (Weick, 1976, 1995).

Communicative processes, because of their profound and demonstrable influence on organizational structures and processes and thus on the human lives working within them, hold ethical implications for organizations: the forces of organizational life are not neutral, and the decisions taking place in organizations works for good or ill on an organization’s participants, both directly, through communicative interaction among persons, and indirectly, through effects on the climate and culture of the organization (Fritz & Omdahl, 2006, p. 118). Fritz (2013) talks about the work of Moch & Fields (1985) in which they describe how organizational participants give meaning to what happens in day-to-day organizational life through communicative action;

communication both reveals and conditions values through language and how culture resides at, or constitutes, the institutional level of communication.

According to Fritz (2013) virtue ethics can be understood from an Aristotelean perspective which assumes a telos, or good of human life defined by the nature of human beings. Virtues are character traits that enable a person to pursue and embody a good human life, a life characterized by human flourishing (Oakley & Cocking, 2001). Because professions are understood to play an important role in the ends of human life, professions and the work of professionals can be understood as fitting within the broad scope of virtue ethics (p. 24). For Plato, one is good to the extent that he possesses virtue, which predisposes him to act in particular ways oriented toward accomplishing the good. Aristotle adds the idea of a telos which brings into the picture the idea that man acts in accord with the ends and purposes of human activity with both happiness and the good performance of one's work as orientations for virtue. The concept of an end or ultimate purpose of human activity speaks to the nature of human beings as having certain goals or aims they characteristically tend towards (McIntyre, 2007, p. 148). The idea of a telos also means that work has an ultimate and can therefore be judged against this end as to whether it assists or impedes achieving the end of human activity. Aristotle's inclusion of work as an orientation of virtue means professions can be judged according to the same criteria as other virtues and therefore be found to be more or less done well. Professions can be evaluated on their contributions to the good of human flourishing (Fritz, 2013, p. 25). Fritz (2013) defines professions, acknowledging influences from Pellegrino (1995) and McIntyre (2007), as "a practice with the tradition that defines its good or goods both as an end of the practice itself and within the larger picture of the good of human life" (p. 26). Businesses are the places in which individual human agents engage in work, or professions, and

can therefore provide for their individual good, and by extension, the good of society. As professions achieve their telos, they contribute to the larger good and are therefore integral contributors to the overall good of human life.

Virtue ethics.

The idea of a virtue ethics framework proposed by Fritz (2013) puts forward the idea that acting virtuously is understood to be an important part of living a good life. It is aligned with the Aristotelean view of humans having a telos which helps define what constitutes virtuous activity and that virtues are part of an interconnected system of goods necessary for flourishing. Virtue ethics rests upon the notion of a telos and the fact that humans typically move towards their end by way of virtuous actions which form a matrix of the good life for human beings (p. 26).

The context, or *polis*, in which professional civility comes into play is the organization. Organizations require coordinated action to accomplish tasks which means communicative acts in the form of organizational communication must occur. Professional civility as a professional communicative virtue protects and promotes coordinated action in organizational life (Fritz, 2013, p. 35). Professional civility is important because of its effect on the atmosphere and environment in which people interact while accomplishing organizational tasks. It matters because of the constructive effects it has on work environments and because it combats incivility's negative effects and creates a supportive environment to accomplish tasks (Fritz, 2013, p. 111). If professional civility is to have its maximum benefit it must begin at the initial stages of organizational socialization. As noted by Kramer (2010), socialization happens when organizational members communicate (p. 4), which helps them to make sense of and adopt practices that both define and construct organizational culture. As new employees join organizations, they are involved susceptible to the organizational version presented to them

through communication with older organizational members. This communicative interaction helps define important aspects of the power dynamic which make each person's place in the social hierarchy more clear. Arnett (1992) describes this process as helping to build the local home or community of memory (Arnett et al., 2009) which defines the organization. Fritz (2013) comments on how organizations begin the socialization process immediately to insure a good semiotic fit and to enable the institution to function smoothly (p. 124). Kramer (2010) puts it this way, newcomers need to learn "how we do things around here" (p. 3).

According to Ashcraft et al. (2009), the constitutive view of communication assumes that communication is "a central organizing process" that "generates, not merely expresses, key organizational realities (p. 2). Communication puts abstract structures in organizational settings into motion, manifesting the joint production of the organization itself including role relationships, organizational structures as well as culture and climate. Communication creates the realities of organizational life (p. 4). The role of language is paramount in organizations and the creation of culture. According to Fritz (2013) language plays several important roles in an organizational setting; it functions to create and maintain socially constructed facts, it establishes, maintains and changes social identity, it creates and maintains power relationships and it serves to attribute desirable and undesirable characteristics to self and others. Language is crucial to the creation of values in organizational settings and thus manifests to the organizational community those values held in high regard. The speech acts take many forms, all carrying varying degrees of illocutionary force (pp. 125-126). The narrative form, according to Cooren (2004), serves a persuasive function, inviting imitation which establishes normative expectations that can be remembered to guide future action (p. 519).

Positive organizing.

Another vein of research shows much promise and lends texture to a discussion of culture in organizations; positive organizing. The idea of this research is that positive emotions have been found to improve individual psychological health and well-being thus improving organizational outcomes (Lutgen-Sandvik et al., 2011). The basis for positive organizing is built on the social constructionist work theory of emotions from Harre` (1986) and Parkinson (1996) that strove to explain the factors and forces associated with positive assessment of behavior. Harre` (1986) took the position that all emotions are intentional and people respond emotionally to someone or something external to them (p. 8). Parkinson (1996) goes further and refines the “someone or something” from Harre` (1986) that people are the most important object in anyone’s environment (p. 664). Positive emotional responses are associated with social interactions and the individuals involved. Parkinson (1996) agrees, “The things that people do and say are typically the things that affect us most, especially if we are involved in some kind of established relationship with them” (p. 664), such as ongoing work arrangements. Harre` also points towards a culture-driven assessment by referencing a “local moral order made up of rights, obligations, duties and conventions” (p. 8). Employees positively assess certain episodes and events because these experiences resonate with their own deeply held beliefs about what is good and bad about working. Creating positive emotions through cultural norms and referents has been linked to a host of desirable social behaviors (Lutgen-Sandvik et al., 2011).

Cameron (2013) points out that studies centered around the concept of the positive are really examinations of virtuousness, or the best of the human condition, which is based on a eudaemonic assumption that an inclination exists in all human systems toward achieving the highest aspirations of humankind (p. 27). Bright et al. (2006) focus on virtuousness in

organizations as being the pursuit of the highest aspirations in the human condition and characterized by human impact; desires or actions without positive human impact are not virtuous, moral goodness; it represents what is good and worthy of cultivation, and unconditional societal betterment; extending beyond mere self-interested benefit and creates social value which transcends the instrumental desires of the actor (p. 251). By emphasizing virtuousness, organizations go beyond the “do no harm” mantra and emphasizes the highest and best of the human condition (Bright, et al., 2006, p. 249). Decisions are made based on doing the “right thing”, even if no clearly identifiable benefits exist. Bright et al. (2006) points out how virtuousness can be conceived as both an individual and collective (organizational) state. On the collective level it takes two forms; virtue in organizations and virtue through organizations. Virtue in organizations relates to the behaviors of individuals that help people flourish while virtue through organizations relates to the enablers in organizations that foster and perpetuate virtuousness (p. 252).

Bright et al. (2006) place positive organizational scholarship as being concerned with examining the development of and the effects associated with virtuousness and eudaemonism, focusing on the behaviors of individual in organizations that are done to help others flourish. There are four main definitions of positive, in positive organizational scholarship; adopting a positive lens, investigating extraordinary positive performance, espousing an affirmative bias and exploring virtuousness, help to frame the boundaries of research (Cameron, 2013, p. 27). According to Cameron (2013) by adopting an affirmative bias, organizations help prioritize positive energy, positive climate, positive relationships, positive communications and positive meanings for individuals and for itself. The positive momentum enables the organization to help its members toward the eudaemonic goal of achieving the highest aspirations of humankind

Eudaimonia: Using Aristotle to Inform Organizational Communication in Order to Reimagine Human Resource Management

excellence or excellence and goodness for its own sake (p. 30). Positive practices do not need to be tied to traditional organizational outcomes to be of worth. Positivity is inherently valued because it is eudaemonic. The irony is that organizations who implement and improved their positive practices also saw increases in their desired outcomes with those organizations who institutionalized positive practices experiencing significantly higher levels of achievement on desired outcomes (Cameron, 2013, p. 31). According to Bright et al. (2006), the benefit of virtuousness as a complement to ethics is two-fold. First it is desirable because ethical codes cannot predict every possible scenario one might face. An ethos of virtuousness can act as a beacon to transcend situational dynamics. Second, the absence of unethical behavior does not mean the presence of highly principled behavior. Ethical standards define for the organizational actors only a minimum threshold for performance and decision-making. If the organizations expects more than the minimum, it must define what that means. A virtue-driven perspective defines what lies beyond the minimum (p. 250). Research on community virtuousness defines it as an embedded characteristic of culture, so that being virtuous means adopting and adhering to the highest qualities of the social system of which you are a part (Jordan & Meara, 1990; Hillefarb, 1996) resulting in social harmony.

Positive organizational scholarship/positive organizing shows great promise for creating a direct link to the eudaemonic concept of a universal telos driving people towards that which is good. If organizations can position themselves, through internal branding efforts as discussed earlier, as one of the means by which individuals can achieve *eudaimonia*, it will entail and result in a major shift in human resource management practice.

CHAPTER FOUR

Aristotle and Eudaimonia

Before a business can position itself as an integral part of a person achieving *eudaimonia*, we must first understand what it is. This section looks at Aristotle's concept of *eudaimonia* including a discussion of the various perspectives and interpretations of its meaning. The monistic versus pluralistic as well as inclusive versus exclusive views are explored. Connections are made to organizational communication, specifically those done internally to create a culture or brand. Integrated marketing communication is discussed as an appropriate strategy for businesses to employ to create a brand. Branding, including emotional branding is looked at as a means for businesses to develop an employment brand. The influence of Maria Montessori is revisited in light of the discussion of branding. The section ends with a review of *eudaimonia* as a concept businesses should leverage when branding themselves.

Allowing ourselves to be informed by Aristotle's concept of a "good life", businesses can better understand how to position themselves as an integral element of a person living said good life. In the *Nicomachean Ethics* (NE) Aristotle talks about what he calls the good life. The idea is that one engages in certain activities with the expressed purpose of attaining some good. Here is how Aristotle introduces his notion of *eudaimonia* in NE:

Since there are evidently more than one end, and we choose some of these (e.g. wealth, flutes, and in general instruments) for the sake of something else, clearly not all ends are complete ends; but the chief good is evidently something complete. Therefore, if there is only one complete end, this will be what we are seeking, and if there are more than one, the most complete of these will be what we are seeking. Now we call that which is in itself worthy of pursuit more complete than that which is worthy of pursuit for the sake of

something else, and that which is never desirable for the sake of something else more complete than the things that are desirable both in themselves and for the sake of that other thing, and therefore we call complete without qualification that which is always desirable in itself and never for the sake of something else. Now such a thing happiness, above all else, is held to be; for this we choose always for itself and never for the sake of some thing else, but honor, pleasure, reason, and every excellence we choose indeed for themselves (for if nothing resulted from them we should still choose each of them), but we choose them also for the sake of happiness, judging that through them we shall be happy. Happiness, on the other hand, no one chooses for the sake of these, nor, in general, for anything other than itself. (1097a25-b7)

Aristotle goes into great detail explaining the reasons, or goods, that compel a person to act or not act. Mackay (2005) describes Aristotle as declaring that a thing desirable for itself and also for its results is less complete (and hence less good) than a thing desirable only for itself and not (also) for its results. Most complete of all (complete without qualification) is that which is always desirable for itself and never for the sake of anything else (p.539). Activities that are done not for their own sake or end, are not considered the final or ultimate good of human activity. This term he reserves for the activities that are done only for their sake or end, activities that have no other result or benefit. According to Bragues (2006) *eudaimonia* for Aristotle means activity that makes appropriate use of our capacities, a way of life in which we are optimally functioning in accord with our purpose as human beings. Anything we choose to do, we do so to realize a goal (p. 343). In his 1999 article, *Quality of Life: Three Competing Views*, Peter Sandoe holds that philosophers today still accept the key Aristotelian idea that there are a number of substantial human values at least some of which have to be realized for a human life

to count as a good life. They would therefore say that there is more to a good life than mere pleasure or preference satisfaction; a good life must realize important human potentials (p. 11). Reeve (2012) also talks about the *eudaimon* life as intrinsically pleasant or enjoyable since the *eudaimon* person would not be anxious about living the life he has chosen as best. Reeve (2012) agrees that *eudaimonia* is an activity and not an emotional state and the activity in which *eudaimonia* consists is more important than the enjoyment of it, since noble activity counts for more than the emotional state it evokes (p. 226). Aristotle uses the example of a person going on a walk. The walk is not the end; rather good health is the end. Or perhaps the happiness gained from good health is the ultimate end.

Differing Interpretations on the Most Final End

There are different ways to interpret what Aristotle is telling us regarding *eudaimonia*, the most final end; is it monistic or pluralistic and is it achieved through action or contemplation.

Monistic.

Lear offers monistic interpretation and insight with her essay on the *Nicomachean Ethics* (2004) explaining that for Aristotle the ultimate good of human activity, *eudaimonia*, is best described as the most final or unqualifiedly final end of human action. Lear interprets Aristotle in NE 1097a35-b5 to be clearly stating that *eudaimonia*, whether it be achieved through activity or contemplation, will be worth achieving for its own sake and never for the sake of anything else that might be gained through it. It is the most final end of a flourishing life. For Lear, Aristotle is emphasizing the “endiness” of the highest good by pointing out that the highest good gives order to our pursuit of goods that we already value for their own sakes (p. 8). Since the most final end is human good, *eudaimonia* is the human good (p. 48). She describes this final end as “the final resting point for all chains of ends; the end that everything aims at but does not

look beyond itself for a source of value (p. 20). Seeing a connection with Plato and Eudoxus, Lear reads Aristotle to think of the end as a good with his specific contribution coming in his belief that the human good, happiness (*eudaimonia*) is an end (p. 15). Aristotle draws an important distinction among ends; some ends are in the activities which attain their end at every moment, and others that are results beyond the activities that produce them. The important part of this distinction for Lear, is the fact that for Aristotle the good is in the end, whether it is the activity or a result beyond the activity. Lear sees the major insight for Aristotle being the fact that human activities tend to fall into hierarchies, with the higher ends being better than lower ones. The ultimate result being that the highest end is the most choiceworthy of the ends in the hierarchy since it is for the sake of the highest end that lower ends are pursued in the first place. The value of the higher end makes the subordinate ends worth pursuing and provides the criteria of success. It also provides the driving *telos*, as the ends of the subordinate activities are designed to achieve the ultimate or final end (p. 16-17). Aristotle in chapter one of the NE, according to Lear, suggests that human good, the end of all choiceworthy activity, is our ultimate object of pursuit, and all the things we make and do are as they are. To the extent that these lower activities succeed in achieving the human good, they themselves are judged good. Lear takes her monistic position and quotes NE 1094a19-21 as a reference to the fact that there must be terminal ends; “we do not choose everything for the sake of something else” ... without a final resting point, “our desire would be empty and vain”. According to Lear’s interpretation of Aristotle there is a difference between ends choiceworthy for the sake of something else and terminal ends at the apex of the hierarchy. The highest good (*eudaimonia*) will be an end of the terminal sort (p. 19). She also offers NE 994b14-16 as clear indication that for Aristotle there are terminal ends; “there would be no reason in the world; the reasonable man, at least, always

acts for the sake of something; and this is a limit, for the end is a limit". Although Lear acknowledges Aristotle himself did not provide a definition of the most final end that guarantees there will be only one, convergent end, she believes his arguments make it clear that he believed that happiness (*eudaimonia*) is meant to be an end upon which all chains of ends, at least the most important ones mentioned in NE I.5, converge (p. 29).

Pluralistic.

Kraut (1989) offers a pluralistic perspective and believes there are several chains/hierarchies in each person's life that contribute to a good life. Kraut (1989) reads Aristotle to offer two answers to the question of what is happiness; the first, best answer is that happiness consists in the virtuous exercise of the theoretical part of reason (*theoria*) with every other good desirable only for the sake of it. The second best answer is that happiness consists in virtuous practical activity (p. 5). Kraut (1989) explains that for Aristotle if the ultimate aim of human life is to use reason well, there are two ways to reach this goal; by leading a philosophical life of contemplation, or by developing practical virtues and exercising them on a grand scale in the political arena (p. 7). Kraut (1989), like Lear (2004), agrees that Aristotle imposed a hierarchical order on the diversity of human ends. Happiness (*eudaimonia*) is the end for the sake of which all others are desired and consists solely in virtuous activity, and is not a composite of all intrinsic goods (p. 9). Kraut (1989) reads Aristotle to say in NE that there are two good ways to live; a philosophical or political life. Each has as its end a single type of activity with all other activities pursued to the end they promote the highest end. The hierarchy designed so that all lower ends lead to the highest end which terminates in virtuous activity. Kraut (1989) points out that in NE 1098a16-18 Aristotle does not say that the good lies merely in virtuous activity, rather he says that " ... and if there are more than one virtue, in accordance

with the best and most perfect”. For Kraut (1989), Aristotle is saying that there are two good ways of living one’s life, in both, the final end consists in a single activity with all other ends pursued to the extent they promote the highest good. Whether philosophical or political life is pursued, all ends are to be arranged in a hierarchy with lower ends arranged subordinate the higher end. Reeve (2012) also interprets Aristotle’s *eudaimonian* goods to be arranged in a hierarchies among ends, or telic hierarchies, in which different endeavors have different ends (p. 228). Reeve (2012) reads NE 1094a16-18 to distinguish between cases in which action is the end, terminal activity, and cases in which the action or activity has some additional end nonterminal activity. If a terminal activity is worthy of choice it must be for its own sake since it is not choiceworthy because of any additional end or good. While things underneath it (nonterminal ends) can be choiceworthy because of it, it cannot be choiceworthy because of anything above it. It must be the apex of the hierarchy (pp. 229-230). Reeve came to the conclusion, in good pluralistic fashion, that the good or happiness Aristotle speaks of is a terminal activity, the end of a maximally architectonic science of politics, and is the apex of the unique telic hierarchy that includes all other choiceworthy ends or goods (p. 234). For Kraut (1989) everything that is not virtuous activity should be pursued for the sake of a higher good, virtuous activity (p. 198). Looking again at Aristotle’s statement in NE 1098a16-18, Kraut (1989) believes him to be singling out virtuous activity as more than just one good among many, and in so doing, gave it a special status as not just a good but the good of human activity. Kraut (1989) considers and rules out the possibility of an endless linear pursuit of goods by looking to the fact that the “for the sake of” relationship is asymmetrical: if A is desirable for the sake of B, then B cannot be desirable for the sake of A. Given the asymmetry of the “for the sake of” relationship coupled with other assumptions Aristotle makes, the hierarchy of ends must

terminate in something that has the following properties: it is desirable in itself, it is not desirable for the sake of something else, and everything else is desirable for its sake. The hierarchy cannot go on indefinitely for then desire would be empty and vain. The hierarchy cannot turn back on itself for then some good would be both more and less choiceworthy than some other good, impossible for Aristotle. So, the hierarchy must terminate in something that is desirable only for itself and not because of some further good (p. 204). Kraut (1989) argues that all hierarchies of ends terminate, or converge, at a final end (so as not to go on in a linear direction indefinitely), but he asserts that Aristotle does not specify that there is only one final end or termination point; “To speak of them as a single end, and to say that everything else is done for the sake of some other good, would be quite artificial” (p. 205). Kraut (1989) believes in one final and most perfect end, contemplation, but believes Aristotle to be saying that it is the end of a hierarchy of good in which each level is subordinate to a higher level until reaching the pinnacle where the final end is achieved. Kraut proposes a read of Aristotle which mandates an exclusive end where the most perfect end is a singular end and not an inclusive end in which all lower ends are a part of the final end, as proposed by Ackrill (1980) and discussed in the next section.

Differing Perspectives on Arriving at Eudaimonia

Inclusive.

The other area of debate is how one arrives at *eudaimonia*; either through action (active political life) and contemplation (philosophy), an inclusive view, or only through contemplation, an exclusive view. J. L. Ackrill’s article in *Essays on Aristotle’s Ethics* (Rorty, 1980) takes the inclusive position that although Aristotle ranks contemplation above the life of action, his argument in Book X does not assert that what makes an action virtuous is its tendency to promote contemplation. Ackrill (1980) takes the position that all action, even when not

explicitly done for the purpose of advancing contemplation, can be virtuous and lead to *eudaimonia*. Looking to NE 1094a16-18, “it makes no difference whether the activities themselves are the ends of the actions or something else apart from these”, he reads the “for the sake of” in Aristotle to mean that goods are pursued both for their own sake as well as for their results, with the results being getting one closer to the final end of happiness. Ackrill (1980) interprets happiness to be a composite of all goods that are desirable for themselves, this reinterpreting Aristotle’s “for the sake of” relationship to be a relation between part and aggregate, where a lower end can be worthy of pursuit as an end in that it will help achieve the higher end of happiness (*eudaimonia*). Ackrill (1980) uses the example of a game of golf being worthy of pursuit for the sake of itself and also for the greater sake of having a good holiday (P. 19). According to Ackrill (1980) the idea that some things are done for their own sake and may also be done for the sake of a higher good is exactly what Aristotle means because *eudaimonia*, what all men want, is not the result or outcome of a life time of effort, or something to look forward to, rather it is a life, enjoyable and worthwhile all through. The fact that the primary ingredients of *eudaimonia* are for the sake of *eudaimonia* is not incompatible with their being ends in themselves, for *eudaimonia* is constituted by activities that are ends in themselves (P. 19). Ackrill explains his reading of Aristotle in chapter 7 of NE to be such that *eudaimonia* is the most final end (most *teleion*), using the example that although pleasure and virtue are goods to be pursued for their own end we also say too that we value them for the sake of *eudaimonia*, whereas nobody ever aims as *eudaimonia* for the sake of them. *Eudaimonia* is the most desirable sort of life, the life that contains all intrinsically worthwhile activities. It is absolutely final and genuinely self-sufficient. It is more desirable than anything else in that it includes

everything desirable in itself. It is inclusive of all intrinsic goods. Eudaimonia, being the most final end includes all final ends (p. 21-23).

Exclusive.

On the contemplative/exclusive side, Hardie (1967) maintains that Aristotle offers a single consistent teaching on the best life throughout the Ethics. According to Aristide Tessitore (1992), Hardie suggests that Aristotle's arguments in Book I are best compared to preliminary sketches made by an artist before he determinately creates the work of art. If Aristotle is "hesitating" between an "inclusive" and "exclusive" formulation of happiness in Book I, this is not the result of any intellectual confusion on his part but is entirely appropriate given the status of Book I as a "sketch" or "outline". Whereas Ackrill (1980) sees an inconsistency between Aristotle's recommendation of wisdom as the dominant ingredient to happiness in Book X and his earlier inclusive recipe for happiness in Book I, Hardie reconciles these differences by emphasizing the tentative character of Book I. With respect to Aristotle's elevation of the theoretical life in Book X, Hardie suggests that the priority given to the contemplative life is "not so absolute as to make comparison and compromise impossible." Whereas Aristotle gives "paramount" place in the good life to contemplation, he also retains a place for family, friends, and the active life of the citizen. Aristotle's assertion that the practice of moral virtue yields happiness in a secondary sense (X, 8), is taken by Hardie to confirm this view. Hardie concludes that the Ethics teaches the wise to cultivate a variety of goods while giving highest priority to the most fully satisfying activity of theory or science (p. 200). Hardie (1967) interprets NE VI 9 to tell us that as a man we have the ability to choose the activities in which we engage and that we should be purposeful in doing so as to aim at some object of the good life. A man of practical wisdom has a true conception of the end or good which is best for him and also plans for its

realization (p. 298). Hobbes (1994) disagrees and remarked in Chapter XI of Leviathan that there was no “*finis ultimis*”, utmost aim, or “*summon bonum*”, greatest good, believing instead felicity to be a continual process attained as one sates one desire after another. For Hardie (1967), man must constantly plan his life out in order achieve his most desired end or good. Looking to NE I 7 Hardie (1967) argues that Aristotle is taking a dominant view of the most final end when he states that happiness is the “most desirable of all things, without being counted as one good thing among others”, meaning that it is achieved by the full and harmonious achievement of one primary desire, philosophy (p. 300). Hardie (1967) notes that Aristotle’s doctrine of the final human good as a plan of life chosen purposefully, must be inclusive of various ends. There is no desire or interest which should not be regarded as a candidate for a place in the pattern of life (Hardie, 1967, p. 317). He also acknowledges that there can also be a dominant end which drives all other decisions, which he agrees should be, according to Aristotle, theoretical curiosity (p. 310).

It is interesting to point out a tangential argument stemming from the discussion around an inclusive versus dominant view of the most final end. Hardie (1967) points out the common criticism of Aristotle’s man to be that he is not virtuous; rather he is a calculating egoist. Man plans his life according to a single driving end and in doing so takes not account of the greater good. Allan (1952) tells us that Aristotle takes little account of the motive of moral obligation, instead stating that mildly enlightened self-interest is the motive for all conduct and choice (p. 189). If morality is to be unselfish with the concept of the greatest good for the greatest number being its mantra, Aristotle’s idea of the final end makes morality ultimately selfish. Hardie (1967) points out that Aristotle does not even adhere to his own doctrine of self-regarding aims

Eudaimonia: Using Aristotle to Inform Organizational Communication in Order to Reimagine Human Resource Management

as the cause of happiness referencing how in NE I 10 Aristotle recognizes that achievement of happiness is largely outside a man's control (p. 321).

Aristotelean Human Resource Management

Having elucidated on the concept of *eudaimonia*, it is to the praxis portion of the discussion that we now move. I propose that organizations should adopt an Aristotelean perspective on human resource management, anchored in the idea that organizational communication, specifically internal branding done to create culture, to help position themselves as an integral part of their employees' achieving *eudaimonia*.

Integrated marketing communication.

Through the creation of a culture, organizations make for themselves a brand, or identity, in the marketplace and more importantly to their employees. Integrated marketing communication (IMC) is a tool organizations use to develop a consistent and repeatable brand identity. IMC can be best defined in its difference from traditional marketing/organizational strategies. In *IMC The Next Generation* Schultz and Schultz (2003) define IMC as a process through which companies accelerate returns by aligning communication objectives with corporate goals (p. 3). Popularized by Joseph McCarthy in the 1950's, and for the following 40 years, marketing was organized around four independent marketing concepts, the 4 P's of product, price, place and promotion. At some point in the 1980's it started to become clear that the siloed approach advocated by the 4 P's had some serious barriers to competing in a market which was increasingly calling for concentration, specifically concentration of product and promotion (Schultz & Schultz, 2003, p. 4). Schultz and Schultz (2003) outline three shifts in the mid-1980's which thrust IMC into the limelight: the development of diffusion of digital technology across the entire spectrum of business operations, the increasing emphasis on brands

and branding as the major competitive differentiating tool and the focus on multinationalization and globalization as marketers spread across the traditional geographic boundaries. They also add one more factor to this list at the time of penning *IMC The Next Generation*, that is, the demand for value-based business approaches that generate cash flows and shareholder value (P. 9). It is with the second of Schultz and Schultz original factors that I will focus my energies, the idea of brand and branding. With the proliferation of technology and the emergence of a new breed of copycat competitors, organizations began to understand and appreciate the importance of a brand. Schultz and Schultz (2003) describe this change, “the focus of much marketing activity changed from communicating what the organization made or did to the creation of brands that had the power to increase the future value of the firm. Intangible, rather than tangible, assets became the battleground for corporate raiders seeking to gain control over these future brand flows” (pp. 11-12).

Schultz and Schultz (2003) believe that a move to IMC is essential for survival due to the marketplace becoming more and more cluttered and confusing. They tout the value of a fully integrated marketing communication system increases as a matter of survival stating that a business must be able to master communication to influence and bind customers to it, must turn its brand and brand relationships into a sustainable competitive advantage, and must find ways to use communication to build long-term brand loyalty (p. 16). S. Alyssa Groom in her *Communication Research Trends* article, Integrated Marketing Communication, speaks to the move from traditional marketing to an IMC approach. She outlines the evolving definition of IMC and illustrates through these changes how the shift has and is moving from marketer as a locus of control to the consumer as the new locus of control. Groom defines this movement as a prophetic response to today’s marketplace, privileging the consumer as the fulcrum for all

marketing planning, strategy and execution. This outside-in approach aligns marketing and marketing communication for the express purpose of navigating change and ambiguity in order to build strong communication plans. Agile internal and external communication strategies make up the ideal commitment of IMC (Groom, 2008). Schultz and Schultz (2003) would agree, stating that “IMC uniquely integrates all the pieces of an organization around a single factor; the wants and needs of customers” (p. 15). IMC moves away from the traditional marketing focus of the anticipation, management and satisfaction of demand through the exchange process to a strategy described by Penaloza & Venkatesh (2008) as intangible services; value as perceived and determined by the consumer in use as benefits of specialized knowledge and skills they label as operant resources; the customer as co-creator of the service; and wealth as obtained in the form of economic capital from consumers to firms in the application and exchange of operant resources by consumers and firms.

IMC is far more than a marketing or communication tactic or technique. According to Schultz & Schultz (2003) it is a processor system that encompasses the activities of not only of the firm but of all its internal and external contacts. It is strategic in nature and is oriented around the firm as a whole rather than around marketing activities (p. 49). Schultz and Schultz (2003) offer eight guiding principles that organizations wishing to utilize IMC must embrace. Principle 1; they must become customer centric and consider the ultimate end user first, foremost and always. Principle 2; use outside-in planning by structuring business systems around customers and prospective customers. Principle 3; focus on the total customer experience including understanding how the product performs in the marketplace, how it is obtained, the capability of channel members to deliver the product, how customer service is delivered and what type of impact our operation has on the community we serve. Principle 4; align consumer

goals with corporate objectives by doing your best to achieve a balance between what the customer wants and what the organization is able to provide. Principle 5; set customer behavior objectives and work to influence a measurable change in the behavior of customers and prospects. Principle 6; treat customers as assets who represent potential flows of income. Principle 7; streamline functional activities by consolidating all the various functional segments marketing and communication managers have created over the years. Principle 8; converge marketing communication activities by blending traditional marcom with electronic marcom activities (pp. 50-66). IMC is carried out via a five-step process of identifying customers and prospects, valuating customers and prospects, creating and delivering messages and incentives, estimating return on customer investment and then budgeting and allocating resources followed by evaluating the effectiveness of your efforts.

Branding.

It is upon brand and branding that I will shift my focus. The following discussion of branding must be viewed with an eye to internal branding, or organizational communication designed to create a culture which positions the organization as an integral element of attaining the good life. Branding has itself, experienced a transition in strategy tied to the shift in marketing strategy. A brand is not a product made in a factory; a brand is made in your mind. Brands can be like a badge that lends you a certain identity. Brands have an identity (Travis 2000). Travis (2000) references Stobart (1994) to lay out a working definition of what constitutes a brand and branding saying that a brand represents a pact between brand owner and consumer. Branding therefore is not a cynical activity imposed on the unsuspecting consumer against his or her will. The brand offers the consumer a guarantee of quality, value and product satisfaction. For Ind (2003) a brand is something owned by buyers and other stakeholders. They

are bundles of ideas permitting the rapid exchange of meaning within conversations. They create decision context and allow stakeholders to make transactional decision, buy or not to buy, as well as relationship decisions, trust or not to trust. Keeping an internal perspective, a purposely crafted organizational brand or culture enables employers to create a tie between itself and its employees. Google works very hard to create a culture that values employees and offers an exciting array of amenities, thus promoting a sense of loyalty and attachment in its employees. According to a prediction by Alexis Tocqueville in the 1830's, new demarcations of social identity would be required in the absence of class distinctions. Tocqueville was commenting on the fact that there would need to be new carriers of social identity as the weight usually associated with representation in a hierarchal social classes, these are what we know as brands.

Travis (2000) considers clever branding to be nothing more than an exercise in loading a product with the social values consumers want. Brand affiliation, or rejection, tells the world who you are and who you want to be, even what you want to believe. He continues by delineating the fact that brands bear both the burden and the strength of a series promise in the minds of customers. Organizations by way of their culture, which is created through communicative interaction, make it clear to their employees what they can and cannot expect from them. The sum of these promises results in an intrinsic worth that translates into sustainable customer/employee loyalty. Brands must also deliver a very real tangible value to go along with the emotional aspects. Branding is the concept of creating value in a product in order to differentiate based on real or imagined qualities. In *Brand Power* Stobart (1994) describes branding as a highly skilled and specialized discipline concerned with managing and maintaining a mix of factors, both tangible and intangible, that attract consumer loyalty. The art of successful branding lies in selecting and blending these elements so that the result is perceived by

consumers to be uniquely attractive and influential on the purchasing decision. According to Stobart (1994) a successful brand must have 3 major factors; a good product, a personality and a guarantee of quality and consistency. Internally, an organization's brand/culture must deliver on its promises as well. Employees, both current and future, must be confident that the organization is who or what it claims to be. The product from this perspective is the job itself with the personality being the promised cultural atmosphere and the quality/consistency being the alignment of all these factors under the stated culture.

On a different front, Nicholas Ind in his book *Beyond Branding*, outlines the social construction of a brand with it starting off with the intent of the brand marketers and senior managers in a company, which is typically itself built through a socializing process of market research, product competencies and many conversations within and outside the company (2003). Turning our attention to Gobe' (2009), he states that emotional branding enables brands to carry on personal dialogues with consumers on the issues which are most meaningful to them. Brands connect with innovative products that are culturally relevant, socially sensitive, and have presence at all points of contact in people's lives. Gobe' (2009) believes the biggest misconception in branding strategies is the belief that branding is about market share when it is really always about mind and emotions share. For him the future of branding is listening carefully to people in order to be able to connect powerfully with them by bringing pleasurable, life-enhancing solutions to their world. Gobe' (2009) advocates the idea of a holistic approach to marketing which he sees as the future of branding as it provides a very personal experience with the product. Internal communicative acts done to create an organizational brand are enhanced if seen through the lens of Gobe's holistic approach. It is essential that organizations be attentive to the changing needs of its employees and prospective employees. As demographics continue

to drastically change the workforce, organizations that wish to be considered employers of choice need to keep their finger on the pulse of what constitutes the good life and work to show how they can help a person move in that direction.

Emotional branding.

Part of the evolution of branding strategy is the idea of emotional branding, a move from product focus to a consumer focus. Due to the change in focus, a change in tactical strategy is also required. Stobart (1994) believes the emotional aspect of products and their distribution systems is the key difference. How a brand engages consumers on the level of the senses and emotions and how a brand comes to life for people is what forges a deeper, lasting connection. Organizations must understand the emotional needs and desires of their customers and must make definite steps towards building stronger connections and relationships. Stobart (1994) sees emotional branding as providing the means and methodology for connecting products to the consumer in an emotionally profound way. It focuses on the desire to transcend material satisfaction, and experience emotional fulfillment. A brand is uniquely situated to achieve this because it can tap into the aspirational drives which underlie human motivation. Brands have moved into the realm of being experiential in that they endeavor to go way beyond the confines of their product dimensions and engender powerful emotions. They give you more than the physical product and provide an experience that engages your imagination and creates their own mind space (Travis 2000). Emotional branding for Gobe` (2009) is the conduit by which people connect subliminally with companies and their products in an emotionally profound way. It comes from partnership and communication. Building the right emotion into a brand is important because it is the promise you make to customers and gives them permission to enjoy the world of the brand. Gobe` lays out his 10 commandments of emotional branding; from

customers to people (customers buy, people live), from product to experience (products fulfill needs, experiences fulfill desires), from honesty to trust (honesty is expected, trust is engaging and intimate), from quality to preference (quality for the right price is a given, preference creates a sale), from notoriety to aspiration (being known does not mean that you are loved), from identity to personality (identity is recognition, personality is about character and charisma), from function to feel (functionality is about practical or superficial qualities, sensorial design is about experiences), from ubiquity to presence (ubiquity is seen, emotional presence is felt), from communication to dialog (communication is telling, dialog is sharing) and from service to relationship (service is selling, relationship is acknowledgment). He also offers 4 pillars of emotional branding; relationship, sensorial experience, imagination and vision which serve as the blueprint of a successful emotional branding strategy.

As mentioned at the beginning of the discussion on branding, there has been a transition in strategy that coincided with and was driven by a shift in marketing strategy. Marketing moved into a postmodern strategy thus pushing brands and branding into a new dimension. Traditional marketing strategy falls into what is described as the cultural authority model. The concept of the consumer culture refers to the dominant mode of consumption that is structured by the collective actions of firms in their marketing activities. It is an irresistible form of cultural authority that generates a limited set of identities accessed through commodities. Holt describes consumer culture as the ideological infrastructure that undergirds what and how people consume and sets the ground rules for marketers branding activities. The branding paradigm is the set of principles that structures how firms seek to build their brands. Firms act as cultural engineers that specify the identities and pleasures that can be accessed only through their brands (Holt, 2002). As cultural engineers, marketers organize how people think and feel through branded

commercial products. Holt describes these corporations as omnipotent who use sophisticated marketing techniques to seduce consumers to participate in a system of commodified meanings embedded in brands. The consumer culture is organized around the principal of obeisance to the cultural authority of marketers. He goes on to spread culpability to the consumers as well who internalized the consumer culture and grant the corporations the authority to organize their tastes. Marketers are the ones who drive popular culture by determining which brands are offered and then parading those brands in front of the consumers. Marketers commodify what is “cool”. Under this model, advertisers methodically drove home linkages between product attributes and a package of desirable personal characteristics that together was declared to constitute the good life (Holt, 2002).

A shift in marketing strategy occurred once consumers began to employ different types of reflexive resistance which challenged the value and “coolness” assigned by marketers to brands and instead assigned their own value. According to Holt (2002), consumer resistance requires the critical ability to filter out market-imposed meanings and the creative ability to produce the self. Resisting the market’s cultural authority in order to enact localized meanings and identities produces a new consumer culture in which identity projects are aligned with acts of consumer sovereignty (Holt 2002). Starting in the 1960’s people increasingly viewed consumption as an autonomous space in which they could pursue identities unencumbered by tradition, social circumstances and societal institutions. The new consumers did not reject branding totally; rather they lost interest in brands that were perceived to be too pushy. Richard Durand and Zarrel Lambert (1985) in their Journal of Advertising article *Alienation and Criticisms of Advertising* talk of how the effectiveness and efficiency in achieving management’s advertising objectives are likely to be adversely affected if consumers in the target audience perceive the acts

as manipulative, suggestive or questionable behaviors and motives on the part of the advertiser, containing limited useful information, or as offensive to their own cultural tastes and values.

Durand and Lambert (1985) believe that [cultural] estrangement pertains to a dislike for many of the trappings of a culture, particularly those that mirror the tastes and values of the masses.

Consumers in a postmodern consumer culture strive to deflect the perceived paternalism of companies. The postmodern branding paradigm is premised upon the idea that brands will be more valuable if they are offered not as cultural blueprints but as cultural resources, as useful ingredients to produce the self as one chooses (Durand, R. & Lambert, Z., 1985).

Google's brand – based in the Montessori Method.

Revisiting Google in light of our discussion of branding, it would be wise to delve into the philosophical underpinnings of their carefully constructed and purposefully perpetuated brand; Maria Montessori and the Montessori method. As discussed earlier, the Montessori method of education was a significant influence on the founders of Google, Sergey Brin and Larry Page during their formative educational years. Montessori schools are nurturing places where children are encouraged to take learning risks and where children pursue their interests as they evolve, instead of forcing them into strict regimes. Mistakes are treated as opportunities for learning as children enhance their natural abilities while developing new ones. Many of the Montessori graduates have attributed the method to their ability to think outside the box. Google's internal branding efforts are largely designed to reinforce the concepts and philosophies of the Montessori method. Employees are treated as creative assets, allowed to explore and make mistakes. The campus culture of "the Plex" allows employees to rid themselves of distractions and focus on being creative and finding better ways to do their jobs. One could even see a bit of Maslow's (1943) hierarchy of needs at work (I will not revisit my

position on Maslow). An argument could be made that Google strives to provide an environment which meets the first four of a person's motivational needs. The amenities and perks associated with being a Googler could be seen as designed to sate the baser needs (physiologic, safety, social and esteem), leaving one to strive for stage 5, or self-actualization. Self-actualization in the Montessori sense, that one can be creative and free to make mistakes and grow.

Brand as a Means to Eudaimonia

If *eudaimonia* is the most final end, the thing for which all humans strive, would it not make sense for businesses to harness the motivational potential of positioning themselves as a means to achieving it. Hardie (1967) reminds us that for Aristotle a good life is a life made up of purposeful decisions, choosing end after end in an attempt to reach the most final end of happiness. Businesses need to create a culture that fosters cooperation and teamwork, allowing individuals to make a better life for themselves and others. Individuals enter into partnerships with the business for which they work. Partnerships are entered into in order to live well. Business must focus on intrinsic rewards as people are their best resource and must also focus on happiness as a reward in order to help motivate people to attain heights of excellence. Business is essentially a partnership of people creating a better life for others and themselves. People and their interactions (communication) are what produce excellence.

What should human resources according to Aristotle look like? What implications does my thesis have for the future of human resource management? These are the questions I deal with in the next section.

CHAPTER FIVE

Human Resource Management According to Aristotle

Allowing ourselves to be informed by ancient philosophy, I will elucidate what I believe would be human resource management according to Aristotle. Utilizing Morris's (1997) thoughts in his book *If Aristotle Ran GM*, a connection will be reestablished with the concept of reciprocity and living a good life. Buber help add texture to the discussion by way of his thoughts on how one should engage the other. The *Polis* is explored by way of a discussion around use and exchange values. The concept of "enough" is also discussed in light of Aristotle views on the good. Additional considerations will lead to a discussion of the ethical implications of an Aristotelean perspective on human resource practices including performance management, training and development as well as compensation. This section includes a discussion of some additional implications of an Aristotelean workplace such as application of the distributive justice and the golden mean. The Catholic social doctrine of distributism, which has connections to Aristotle's thoughts on distributive justice are also covered. The section culminates with a summary and come concluding thoughts.

Aristotle as Chief Human Resource Officer

Morris (1997) in *If Aristotle Ran GM* takes a look at the prospect of applying the Aristotelian principal of reciprocity to modern business practices. For Morris, Aristotle views the polis as a partnership for living well and saw the city philosophically as a collaboration, a partnership entered into for a purpose, the purpose of living well (pp. 102-103). He describes a business as not primarily a building, or a collection of buildings, with all contained equipment, and it's not mainly a set of organizational structures or processes for providing a product or service. It is a partnership of people creating in many ways a better life for others as well as

themselves (p. 103). Morris sees business as being activities creating, maintaining, and altering structures within which people can enter into partnerships for living well. They ideally contribute to the world structures within which we can grow, develop, and provide for both ourselves and others what is needed for the living well. If Aristotle ran General Motors, everyone employed there would think of it as one huge partnership, encompassing myriads of smaller partnerships for the purpose of living well (p.104). A business, according to Morris (1997) is a series of activities that create a structure for human beings to enter into relationships, relationships that are inherently reciprocal. Ultimately those within the business should prosper and live better because of the business as should those affected by its operation. Morris uses the phrase “people in partnership for a shared purpose”, which I assert is really his way of describing reciprocity. He goes on to explain what he means by this phrase, “The partnership should be a true collaboration, with the active engagement of all parties bring the best of who they are , what they know and what they can do to that collaboration, with both respect and honor flowing from each partner to each other partner” (Morris, 1997, p. 105). Here he describes in great detail an arrangement in which people come together in reciprocal relationships where all members benefit from the collaboration.

Business must focus on intrinsic rewards as people are the best resource – focus on happiness as a reward will help motivate people to attain heights of excellence. Business is essentially a partnership of people creating a better life for others and themselves. People and their interactions (communication) are what produce excellence. Morris (1997) takes the perspective that people at work are the only true foundation for lasting excellence, and he believes we must focus on the deeply humane issues of happiness, satisfaction, meaning, and fulfillment in the workplace. He points out how study after study has shown extrinsic rewards

such as pay raises and promotions to be less than effective at long-term employee motivation.

Without the intrinsic rewards of happiness, fulfillment, and a sense of goodness and meaningfulness at work, people will never be fully motivated to attain the heights of excellence of which they are capable. (p. xiv) For Morris (1997) the problem of happiness is an important one because the basic assumption upon which we rested, that hard work results in a measure of success and happiness, has come to be null. A new reality has asserted itself that no matter how hard or well a person works, conditions outside of one's control can cause them to be unemployed (p. 7). Morris (1997) sums up Aristotle to say that all men seek the same thing: happiness. He quotes Blaise Pascal in support of his summation, "All men seek happiness. This is without exception. Whatever different means they employ, they all tend to this end. The cause of some going to war, and of others avoiding it, is the same desire in both, attended with different views. The will never takes the least step but to this object. This is the motive of every action of every man, even of those who hang themselves." He believes that if we [business leaders and employees] can get in touch with the fact that happiness is the universal human quest underlying every other activity, we can touch the innermost heart of human motivation and unlock the deepest secret of sustainable success in all our effort together (p. 11).

Morris (1997) talks about the three different types or definitions of happiness: the hedonistic view of happiness as the same thing as pleasure, the view of happiness as personal peace and the view of happiness as participation in something fulfilling. The hedonistic view advocates the pursuit of things because they bring pleasure either in themselves or in what they make possible, and that it is precisely the pleasure they provide this is the essence of happiness. In NE Aristotle speaks to the pursuit of pleasure as happiness as being fit for grazing cattle but not human beings, "the mass of mankind are evidently quite slavish in their tastes, preferring a

life suitable to beasts” (Nicomachean Ethics, 1095b 20). The enjoyment of the spoils of hard work such as money, position or authority are not the same thing as happiness. For Morris (1997), what matters most is the overall process in which these enjoyments have a place. If we want the people around us to be happy in the business we do together and we want to be happy in our work, we have to look beyond immediate gratification (p. 13). The position that happiness is akin to personal peace is an attractive perspective and one privileges calmness. Mid twentieth-century philosophers (e.g. Ellul, 1964 & McLuhan, 1962) have spoken about technology and how it will produce an increased level of leisure in society. Action is an essential part of a good life according to Aristotle. Drawing heavily from Aristotle, Morris (1997) makes the clear distinction that a happy life is one lived actively and purposefully. Happiness never exists in passivity. It is in fact a dynamic phenomenon of participation in something that brings fulfillment (p. 17). The final view that happiness as participating in something fulfilling stems directly from the idea that happiness is found in action. Morris quoting Cicero in his essay *De Finibus* states that “The soul ever yearns to be doing something.” The idea is that as humans we are most happy when engaged in virtuous activity, the joy of doing something which matters beyond one’s own self-interest or pleasure. According to Morris (1997), happiness is connected with peace as well as with pleasure, but ultimately to be found in the activity, in the work (p. 17).

Morris (1997) posits the existence of four universal dimensions of human experience which are key to happiness as work and thus corporate excellence. They are: the intellectual dimension which aims at truth, the aesthetic dimension which aims at beauty, the moral dimension which aims at goodness and the spiritual dimension which aims at unity.

Business needs to understand and embrace these four dimensions and their accompanying end if we are to reimagine how human resources is done and truly tap into the deepest

touchstones of ultimate human fulfillment (Morris, 1997) to motivate people. People need to become the focus and human resources is all about the people (Fuss, 2016). It is the people within any enterprise, and their interactions with each other, that ultimately produce excellence or mediocrity (Morris, 1997, p. 20).

Modern science and *telos*.

Let's consider some cutting edge scientific research as a means to explain the importance of people and their interactions to an organization. The Higgs-Boson super collider has been attempting to prove the existence of a "god" particle in the universe as a way to explain what Aristotle simply called *telos*, that is, a system's ultimate end. An Aristotelean perspective of an organism is that it possesses all that it needs to become what it is designed to be. This is the acorn becoming the oak metaphor Aristotle uses. As a system, the acorn contains all the potential to become the oak, given the right conditions. However, if you break down a living organism and examine its parts, something is lacking. The total is greater than the sum of the parts. In organisms the missing part is the life force provided by God. Looking at organizations from an Aristotelean perspective we have the same situation. Organizations are large, complex systems in which people interact and create the same kind of "life force", only in organizations the life force is created through communicative acts between employees, not endowed by God. Renowned scientist John Holland from the University of Michigan was quoted as saying about any sufficiently complex system, "We can't add up the parts and understand the whole, for that does not give a good picture of what the system does. The interactions are just as important as the parts." Once again the importance of people and their interactions are emphasized. And HR is all about the people.

As people seek the end of truth it becomes clear how, as a business, we can leverage this need to our fullest advantage. The search for knowledge and expertise has become the main focus of organizations as markets have shifted to be knowledge and service based. Intellectual capital is the coveted asset in business today. We all have minds that must be respected and used. The first implication of this is that mindless work cannot be satisfying. No human being is a machine, and yet that's exactly what much of the economic theory and management practice of the last hundred years has tended to assume. (Morris, 1997, P. 26). Truth in the form of intellectual property is important, but it is equally as important that employees are honest and truthful. Organization must cultivate a culture that values truth in order to steer clear of business pitfalls and ethical dilemmas.

Buber and truth in relationships.

Morris (1997) points to Martin Buber and his seminal work *I and Thou* for a frame of reference on the importance of truth, especially as it pertains to working relationships. It is important to revisit the discussion of Buber from chapter 2. In *I and Thou*, Buber (1970) describes two fundamental relationships that can exist between you and the other. They are the I-it relation and the I-Thou relation. A Troup-style summary of the three sections will be helpful in connecting truth to creating an organizational culture that fosters happiness which leads to success. The first part of the book examines the human condition by exploring the psychology of individual man. Here Buber establishes his crucial first premise that man has two distinct ways of engaging the world: experience and encounter. He introduces his concept of primary word pairs (I-it and I-You). The word pair I-It refers to the experience mode of being and tends to be the mode which most humans use. In this mode the object of experience (the It) is something to be utilized, known or put to use. The experiencing I in this mode of engaging the

Eudaimonia: Using Aristotle to Inform Organizational Communication in Order to Reimagine Human Resource Management

world is an objective observer and not an active participant. The I-Thou word pair refers to the encounter mode in which the I enters into a relationship with the encountered other and both are transformed by the relation. In this mode, the I encounters the entirety of the Thou rather than experiencing solely its attributes. If put into organizational language, businesses should strive to create a culture in which employees engage with one another completely and respect and appreciate the differences that exist. When employees in an organization (the I in Buber's primary word pair) respects and responds to others (the Thou in Buber's primary word pair) can an organization create a culture which fosters *eudaimonia*. When employees respond to the other, selfish behaviors are curtailed and truth prevails as individuals enter into relationships based on reciprocity. In part two Buber looks at modern society and notes it is based on the I-It mode of interaction. He attributes man's feelings of alienation to the fact that we view the world under the I-It mode. In the third section Buber gives us his solution to modern man's woes. He has already made it clear in the previous two sections that this solution will involve opening ourselves up to encounter and building a society based on relation to Thou's rather than experience of It's. In every human encounter that we undergo, we feel that there could be something more, something more lasting and more fulfilling. This "more" is encounter with God, or absolute relation (Buber, 1970). After absolute encounter we come to see every other being (nature, animals, people) as a Thou. We come to feel affection for everyone and everything, and to have a sense of loving responsibility for the whole course of the world. The I-Thou mode of engagement is one businesses should strive to reach. Buber (1970) provides another reference point for my earlier assertion that reciprocity is the proper paradigm for interaction between individuals.

Economy and the *Polis*

Expanding upon the earlier brief discussion of economics according to Aristotle from chapter 2, we will dive deeper to look at the formation of economy as we have come to understand it. I contend that businesses must get back to a *polis*, in our case the organization and its culture, based on ethics and the proper type of economic activity which includes acknowledging the concept of enough.

Phusis and nomos.

In order to explain the notion of economics in ancient world we must look at the concepts of Phusis and Nomos. Phusis or nature is translated as *natura* in Latin. This is the realm of permanence where things are always the same, or are the same for the most part. The human realm is the realm of rhetoric and the realm of change. Human beings exist in nature and are different in nature than all other animals because they have language and they operate to imitate nature. The life world, or realm of change, is the realm where human beings interact with one another. This is not the realm of law but the realm of history. Nomos, on the other hand is the human world, the created world. Nomos is a matter of agreement, custom, tradition. It can be translated as law, in the sense of human agreement, not as a physical law. *Nomos* has several important characteristics; it is ethical, phenomenal, historical, humanistic, linguistic, political and rational. Ethical is that meaning is a matter of choice. Phenomenal because of the interaction of ourselves and the world. Historical in that we operate across time and place with different choices. Humanistic because we are part of the human world. Linguistic in that humans have language and deal with one another and the world through language. Political because the nature of our (human) being is that we cannot become what we are separate from the polis and the polis cannot exist without humans. Finally, rational because the choices we make are seminal.

Use value.

In ancient society a thing is defined by its “use value”. Quality is the only concern in making or producing a product. Aristotle recognizes the potential negative effect of money. He believes that any activity can be corrupted by money. Society is concerned with use and the idea of quality. The world of *nomos* changes from time to time and place to place so exchange tends to be temporal or local. The exchange then becomes a matter of *nomos* or a matter of convention, a matter of agreement and persuasion; what you can persuade someone to do. Exchange drives people to gather in the polis to take advantage of the division of labor (Meikle, 1995, p. 85). Rhetoric is concerned with the notion of economics but examines it as a science. Money is introduced as a manner of facilitating exchange, especially for facilitating exchange over time and distance. In this sense, money exists only as a means (Pol. 1, 1258b4-5). Exchange should be a matter of *philia*, or the love of the brother. Under this model you are not trying to take advantage of someone, rather you are making a good faith exchange. *Philia* ultimately holds the polis together and created the need for the division of labor and exchange. Looking back to Aristotle (1999), we see that he seeks to uncover our surety in the justice of exchange so that we end up with equality and/or reciprocal proportions. He is unable to find this quantifiable thing, it does not exist in nature (NE 5, 1133a16-19). For him, this is the problem of exchange which starts to emerge in a profound way based on the division of labor. Is there something natural (by nature - *phusis* or *physis*) or is it conventional (by convention - *nomos*)? For Aristotle, it is by convention. If we cannot account for exchange via *phusis*, we contend for it via *nomos*.

Money.

The notion of money caused the accumulation of wealth to become an end unto itself. Because money, as a commodity, is portable, it allowed individuals to amass more than was necessary for reciprocal transactions. Human propensity drives us to consume and become competitive about it. In modern economics there is no notion of enough. The question then becomes: what is the justification for more than enough? According to Aristotle wealth is a sufficient stock of the things useful for living the good life. Enough is the point when we have sufficient stock to live the good life. Meikle (20005) describes wealth accumulation as the end of bad *chrematistike*. He points out that “limit” (*peras*) is an important idea for Aristotle, however, in the pursuit of wealth as exchange value “there is no limit to the end it seeks; and the end it seeks is wealth for the sort we have mentioned... the mere acquisition of money” (Aristotle, 1986, 1, 1257b33ff). Every end imposes a limit on means. Every art has an end, and the means to that end are not unlimited, but limited to those means needed to attain it. True wealth is not an end but a set of means for attaining ends (pp. 76-77). According to Meikle (2005), Aristotle holds that a polis needs to have enough (be *autarkes*), in order to have enough it needs wealth, wealth consists of the tools or useful things, that these tools are limited in size and number by the ends they serve, with the result that the good life and its ends set the standard for deciding how much wealth is enough (p. 45). With a definition like “the good life” being subjective, human behavior and nature drives us to continually push that point back in favor of having just a little bit more. We must regress a bit and consider the overarching question of what is this ultimate goal of human life? According to Aristotle, one thing is clear from the beginning, “wealth is evidently not the good we are seeking” (Aristotle, 1985, 1096a, 6). As discussed in depth in chapter 3, happiness or *eudaimonia*, is the ultimate good of human life.

Eudaimonia: Using Aristotle to Inform Organizational Communication in Order to Reimagine Human Resource Management

Dierksmeier & Pirson (2009) in their essay *Too Much is Too Much* strive to answer the questions, what, materially, constitutes happiness? For them *eudaimonia* connotes a well-ordered state of affairs (Dierksmeier & Pirson, 2009). Aristotle does not extol subjective states of euphoria, received passively through the senses. Rather *eudaimonia* describes an objective state of being, to be attained by rational activity (Aristotle, 1985, 1098a, 3-8). Individuals are “happy” (well-ordered), when they rationally harmonize their outer and inner world so as to live self-sufficiently (Aristotle, 1985, 1097b, 15-16). Not fortune or fortunes, but a communal and virtuous lifestyle makes for happiness (Dierksmeier & Pirson, 2009). Happiness is not purely an individual matter for it can only be realized within a social network of relations with others. We are social and political animals, drawn together not simply out of instinct, necessity or utility, but because nature inclines us in that direction with a view towards our end, or telos, which is nothing less than our perfection as human beings (NE, 1252b28-1253a3). Society completes us (NE, 1253a25-27). As such, Aristotelian business ethics will consist of those principals that further the good life within the social context provided by commercial activities (Bragues 343). Hardie (1967) adds some insight into Aristotle’s thoughts on man’s pursuit of happiness by asserting the family and the state, and other forms of association are necessary for the full realization of any man’s capacity for living well (p. 303).

Managing communities.

For Aristotle the function of economics (*oikonomia*) is to demonstrate how to govern such public and individual households (*oikoi*) through adequate norms (*nomoi*) of conduct. One can extend this theory of individual and public household management to the management of today’s corporations, since they too are communities in which common purposes are pursued by organized efforts (Wijnberg 2000, p.334). Obviously, the differences between a modern,

shareholder-oriented corporation and ancient households bar treating them the same. Yet as social organizations they also feature certain structural commonalities that allow the transfer of some insights about the successful management of one to the other. All households and organizations, for instance, must acquire the resources necessary to reach their objectives. It is here that the question of whether or not the art of getting wealth is the same with the art of managing a household or a part of it, or instrumental to it; (...) (Aristotle, 1986, 1256a, 3-5). For Solomon (2004), Aristotle's answer is quite blunt and has brought him a reputation for being an "enemy of business" (p.1021): There are two sorts of wealth-getting, (...); one is a part of household management, the other is retail trade: the former necessary and honorable, while that which consists in exchange is justly censured; for it is unnatural, and a mode by which men gain from one another (Aristotle, 1986, 1258a, 38-1258b, 2). It is not from anti-commercial sentiment, consequently, that he argues against some forms of retail trade, but from a view upon what constitutes an appropriate as opposed to an excessive pursuit of wealth. Ideally, our internal concept of the good life defines our relationship with external goods, rather than that inversely material conditions dictate all our intents and purposes. Economic assessments have to be made from the critical evaluation of our needs, not vice versa. This is the understanding that is central to Aristotle's economic philosophy; that the quantity of material goods we consume must be in proportion to the specific quality of our needs. Economic analysis is thus not free-standing; success in both business and economics cannot be defined by quantitative parameters alone but in reference to qualitative criteria (Wijnberg 2000, p.333). The standards for this assessment we glean from moral philosophy insofar as it deals with the heterogeneous and incommensurable nature of our values (Nussbaum 1990, p.59). Economics is hence fundamentally welded to the moral and political discourse in society. To Aristotle, there can be

too much or too little of nearly everything; too much or too little sunshine for a plant, too much or too little food for an animal, and also, there can be too much or too little wealth for a person (Aristotle 1981, 1231b 31). For some, the idea of too much wealth may seem odd. Who would reject having more choices rather than fewer? And so, who would not prefer more rather than less from an all-purpose means such as money? Isn't amassing property tantamount to stocking up freedom and well-being? Aristotle teaches caution against these assumptions. In all realms of life, he advocates moderation and measure, defining virtue as the rational pursuit of a mean between harmful extremes (Aristotle, 1985, 1094b, 14-15). Excess, in other words, is bad in itself. Skidelsky & Skidelsky (2012) offer an explanation of human insatiability based on Tibor Scitowsky's 1976 book *The Joyless Economy* in which restlessness and economic scarcity drive the endless pursuit of wealth. Restlessness drives a person to continually seek stimulating experiences as we become bored with what we have. The more a person has the more frantic the search for more and different stimuli becomes. The inherent scarcity of certain goods means that certain luxuries are not attainable without considerable affluence. People who desire the finer things in life work harder and harder to accumulate the necessary resources to afford them only to see the prices continually rise due to increased demand which means working even harder. And so the endless cycle continues. Skidelsky & Skidelsky (2012) believe the eclipse of the good life by an economy based on the conflation of wants versus needs is to blame for the modern tendency towards insatiability. "Detached from any vision of the human good, and fomented by envy and boredom, wants multiply like the heads of the mythical Hydra" (p. 94).

Dierksmeier & Pirson refer to the example Aristotle uses of Milo, a well-known wrestler of his time, to illustrate that what constitutes excess depends on a number of factors (2009). Aristotle illustrates the point by referring to the very high meat consumption of Milo. It may be

that, given his exercise schedule and physique, an enormous amount of meat intake is “good” for Milo; for everybody else it would be bad, because it would be excessive (Aristotle, 1985, 1106b, 5). Applied to the pursuit of wealth, this notion leads to the following characteristics: The man who is more pleased than he ought to be by all acquisition and more pained than he ought to be by all expenditure is mean; he that feels both feelings less than he ought to is prodigal. (...) And since the two former characters consist in excess and deficiency, and where there are extremes there is also a mean, and that mean is best, (...), it necessarily follows that liberality is a middle state between prodigality and meanness as regards getting and parting with wealth (Aristotle, 1981, 1231b, 31-39). Wealth, to repeat, is for Aristotle not an end in itself but a means to the good life: a subordinate end (Aristotle, 1985, 1096a, 6). As a functional good, wealth “consists in using things rather than in owning them; it is really the activity, that is, the use of property that constitutes wealth” (Aristotle 1994, 1361a, 23). It follows that wealth is to be evaluated by how it facilitates the well-ordered or happy life. Wealth cannot be maximized, all else being equal. The pursuit of wealth changes the inner and outer conditions in which it takes place. In modern business-speak, there are economic opportunity costs to its quest in that other endeavors are not undertaken; other, perhaps worthier, ends might not be pursued (Lowry 1987, p.234). There are satisfaction points for each economic unit. To strive beyond those in the pursuit of wealth documents a harmful desire of wanting ever more (*pleonexia*), that is, people show no moderation mostly because they lack virtue or follow a hedonistic conception of the good (Aristotle, 1985, 1129b 9-1130a, 17). Aristotle also had a keen sense that such limitless pursuit of riches on part of some impoverishes others and undermines society (Aristotle, 1986, 1323a, 35-1323b, 10).

Right and wrong economic activity.

Aristotle (1986) makes his differentiation between the right and the wrong kind of economic practice pretty clear: “Of the art of acquisition then there is one kind which by nature is a part of the management of a household, in so far as the art of household management must either find ready to hand, or itself provide, such things necessary to life, and useful for the community of the family or state (...). They are the elements of true riches; for the amount of property which is needed for a good life is not unlimited (...). But there is a boundary fixed, just as there is in the other arts (...) (1256b, 27-34). Money-making, or wealth-getting (*chrematistike*) are here still integrated into a purpose-bound and socially embedded household economy (*oikonomia*). Yet they can also be torn apart from this context and turned into a boundless pursuit of profit. There is another variety of the art of acquisition which is commonly and rightly called an art of wealth-getting, and has in fact suggested the notion that riches and property have no limit. Being nearly connected with the preceding, it is often identified with it. But though they are not very different, neither are they the same.” (Aristotle, 1986, 1256b, 40-42); “(...) in this art of wealth-getting there is no limit of the end, which is riches of the spurious kind, and the acquisition of wealth” (Aristotle, 2007, 1257b, 28).

The household accordingly is to Aristotle not an economic entity first and then a political community, but initially he conceptualizes it an integral unit of the polis. One should view the corporation not as profit-machines first and then pose the question how such “mechanical monsters” (Solomon 2004, p.1033) suddenly come to have social responsibilities. Rather, firms should be viewed as corporate citizens with social responsibilities. Moreover, Aristotle’s framework allows for overcoming the unproductive bifurcation between selfish and altruistic transactions in business (Dyck and Kleysen 2001, p.563). By their very nature, business

Eudaimonia: Using Aristotle to Inform Organizational Communication in Order to Reimagine Human Resource Management

organizations are committed to the interest of their members while servicing the greater community that enables their activities (Solomon 2004, pp.1024-1028). The postulate for ethical conduct in the business field, consequently, neither entails undue self-sacrifice, nor does it require ordinary men to behave like saints. It only demands to realize what the corporation, in fact, is, i.e. a social institution, where behavior is modeled, customs are shaped, and people engage in forms of conduct with moral and political significance (Wijnberg 2000, p.340). To use the perspective of virtue and the lens of a philosophy of the good life in the business context is hence “a way of understanding or (re)conceiving what management is, not as a way to pass moral judgment on it” (Dyck and Kleysen 2001, p.565). Bragues (2006) provides some recommendations as to how one can render business into a more conducive site for the realization of Aristotle’s good life: Have ... more participatory workplace where employees can contribute their particular expertise and play a greater role in company decisions, less hierarchical structures and have more shared responsibilities in order to reduce the necessity of unreflective order taking and mind-numbing specialization, an atmosphere where more respect is shown employee’s rationality by ensuring that management liberally discloses information pertaining to the firm’s condition and prospects and provide reasons for company policies, ample resources devoted to research and development, especially of the pure kind that does not immediately lead to commercially viable products, advertising campaigns with relatively little in the way of raw imagery and mental associations, combined with more appeals to people’s reasonableness, greater willingness on the part of companies to hire and better compensate liberal arts students, while requiring that those graduating from business programs, both undergraduate and MBA levels, have completed a significant concentration in philosophy, theology, astronomy and physics, policies in place to ensure workers the leisure time necessary

for study and reflection by prohibiting long work weeks, except when circumstances require it, sabbaticals available to employees on the condition that the time away from work will be used for philosophic contemplation, sponsorships for artists whose work thoughtfully explores the human condition, a company library and hire graduate students to lead employee reading groups (p. 354-355). The *NE* and *The Politics* point to Aristotle's emphasis on tying business morality to a universal conception of the good life. This conception defines personal happiness to chiefly consist in practicing the virtues, a life in which both desire and the pursuit of wealth is kept under check. According to Aristotle, people are called to display courage, self-restraint, generosity, magnificence, magnanimity, sociability, justice, prudence and wisdom in their business activities. From an Aristotelean point of view, the greatest ethical imperative for business is to give individuals opportunities to thoughtfully participate in the management of company affairs and to contemplate the ultimate meaning of things (Bragues, 342). O'Toole (2005) offers a similar perspective on what an Aristotelean workplace looks like; "If Aristotle is right that the good life entails developing one's human potential, then providing conditions in which employees can do so is a clear moral responsibility of leaders or work organizations." Business leaders have inherited the ethical roles, tasks and responsibilities of Aristotle's virtuous political leaders to provide society with the goods and services it needs in an economically efficient manner while at the same time providing the environment for the intellectual and moral development of employees (pp. 228-229).

According to Morris (1997) people prefer to work for a company that has the same beliefs and values as they do; something good and noble. As such, good works should not be considered a sideline for business, rather they can become a solid support for commercial

success. Creating a climate of goodness... will always pay great dividends for the overall flourishing of the business (p. 126-127).

Global business applications.

Another area where Aristotelean business ethics can be applied is in the area of cross-cultural or global business practices. How should a business deal with varying cultural norms that conflict with their domestic mores? Cultural relativism has its roots in the sophists who opposed natural theories of justice, holding that right is a human construct reflecting the peculiarities of a particular time and place. The sophists believed notions of justice varied from one nation to the next, while at the same time there exists universally accepted notions, such as sexual desire. Bragues (2006) interprets Aristotle in NE 1134b18-1135b15 to insist that the distinction between natural and legal justice to be real. Although acknowledging differences between cultures, Aristotle does not agree with relativism owing to the fact that variances can exist consistent with natural forces or in opposition to them. A right handed person can learn to be stronger with his left hand without ceasing to be right handed. Justice supports conduct involving the least cost for society to cultivate. Aristotle likens merely legal rules to standard measures; a framework for facilitating social interactions (NE 1134b20-23). Natural justice for Aristotle is a set of dictates that optimally enables an association of individuals each to actualize self-perfection in a manner that does not make war with the dominant inclinations of the human soul. The moral virtues are in accord with reason, not evoked by it. Aristotle insists the moral virtues are acquired through constant practice and that laws must continually reinforce what early education implanted because vice is so very tempting. Aristotle goes so far as to say in NE that “most people obey necessity rather than argument, and punishment rather than what is noble” (NE 1180a4-5), giving credence to the need for the existence and strict enforcement of

corporate codes of ethics as well the need for business ethics to be strongly informed by government regulations (Bragues, p. 346).

Profit versus wealth.

Turning a profit and creating wealth, teaches Aristotle, are not the same. It is the latter that legitimizes and limits the former. Lear in Blackwell (2006) comments that for Aristotle a life dominated by instrumental activity or profit-seeking is forced even when it is chosen by someone of his own volition. Because instrumental activity is worth choosing only for the sake of the product it creates, there is a sense in which it is onerous. The agent is acting as a living tool in the service of his needs and works for the sake of another, not for another person, but for a condition of relative leisureliness and self-sufficiency that is not his own. On the other hand, people who act finely behave in a way that presupposes that they are free of the burden of meeting external demands on their own basic needs and thus their fine action expresses their success. For Aristotle, leisure and self-sufficiency are necessary conditions of human flourishing (NE I.7.1097b4-6). We can extend to the modern corporation the qualified approval of the pursuit of profit that Aristotle accords to all households (Collins 1987, p.570). For the latter a pursuit of profit is acceptable when it is not excessive, does not harm the community, and when it remains subordinated to the pursuit of goals that are economic and not merely chrematistic in nature. The same can be said for corporations. Maximization of any kind precludes moderation and stands in the way of achieving the golden mean, unless the calculus of maximization is tied to the goal of *eudaimonia*. The traditional view of neoclassical economics is that if profit is pursued, the utility of everyone is increased as a consequence. Utility is understood as a synonym for happiness, and hence profit maximization seems causally linked to happiness increases, at least theoretically. A clear-cut causality does not exist. Already in Aristotle's times

it was evident that wealth and well-being were neither causally related, nor even highly correlated. It is precisely for this reason that Aristotle distinguishes between the notions of hedonic and eudaimonic happiness. The former, induced by the senses and pleasures, is rather short-lived, and can often be acquired by wealth. Produced by virtuous behavior, the latter aims at excellence in all its dimensions, is less immediate but longer-lived, and cannot be procured through wealth. According to Bragues (2006), although ethics is not always consistent with success in business, Aristotle contends that no matter how bleak it seems that one should stick to the path of virtue in the reasonable hope that the strong connection between doing good and living joyfully will eventually reassert itself and give way to the improvement of one's fortunes. (NE 1100b12-21) (p. 345). Management and leadership in the 21st century need to learn that serving society while making financial profits is a requirement for the future. The decisive shift in strategy must come from a change in corporate philosophy. A paradigmatic shift back to reciprocity is needed to allow businesses to create the kind of culture necessary to be regarded as an integral part of a person achieving the required amount of wealth to live a good life.

Reimagining Human Resource Practices

Performance management.

Like the previous discussion relating to the creation of culture, performance management systems must be reimagined in order to position organizations to implement a truly merit-based distribution of resources. Performance management is defined as the process by which an organization assures that individual outcomes support organizational outcomes (Mello, 2011). There are many types of tools and processes involved. The most appropriate performance management tool organizations have at their disposal for determining resource distribution is known as management by objectives (MBO). MBO is a process where employees agree to

performance objectives prior to the appraisal period and are then managed to those objectives (Mello, 2011). Individual performance is the primary determinant of pay increases (resource allocation). Traditional merit-based methods of distribution possess inherent biases injected by the appraiser. The problem is that as humans we tend to take the path of least resistance when it comes to evaluating performance. Managers tend to be overly lenient, overly critical or middle of the road. If organizations are operate according to Aristotle's concept of distributive justice, performance management must be done according to strict and unflinching standards tied directly to an assessment of the relative value of the job. HR must perform thorough job evaluations so that organizations understand the contribution of each individual job to its overall success. This will enable organizations to make distribution decisions based on merit, not on some other subjective basis. Additionally, an important element of performance management in an Aristotelean workplace would be the solicitation of ideas from every level of the organization. The goal of governance for Aristotle (business strategy in modern terms) is to determine the best possible means. What should matter in work organizations is tapping into all sources of practical wisdom, regardless of where it is found.

Virtuous leaders.

O'Toole (2005) offers a two-fold recommendation on the main challenges of virtuous business leaders as being to create a process for eliciting and evaluating ideas from across the organization and creating systems of governance in which all employees find themselves in groups small enough to have a meaningful say in decisions directly affecting their own work. He goes on to conclude that a modern Aristotelean workplace will have four primary characteristics: (1) a real opportunity for all workers to learn and to develop their talent and potential, (2) all

employees participate in the decisions that affect their work, (3) all employees participate in the financial gains resulting from their own ideas and efforts, and (4) virtuous leaders (pp. 230-231).

Development.

Organizations that strive to offer opportunities for their employees to develop their skills and maximize their potential are said to be learning organizations. Learning organizations work hard to create a culture where continuous improvement is valued and rewarded. Complementary HR policies and programs (i.e. skill-based pay) reinforce the focus on skill acquisition, application and knowledge sharing (Mello, 2011). Aristotelean managers striving to maximize employee contributions will be sure to ask themselves a few important questions: To what extent do I consciously make an effort to provide learning opportunities to everyone who works for me?, To what extent do I encourage full participation by my employees in the decisions that affect their work? and To what extent do I measure my own performance in terms of economic measures as well as using my wisdom to create conditions under which my employees can seek to fulfill their potential? (O'Toole, 2005, pp. 241-242). Self-managing work teams (SMWT) is an effective strategy for providing all employees a platform to participate in decision-making, specifically those affecting their work. Self-managing work teams (SMWT) are designed such that the team is given complete managerial control over the entire manufacture/delivery of a product/service. SMWT are responsible to manage the hiring, performance, discipline and firing of its members. All issues related to or affecting their work product is the responsibility of the team. Complementary HR policies and programs (i.e. team-based compensation) reinforce the autonomous, yet interrelated nature of the team. As noted in the previous two examples, compensation is often times a complementary policy or program. If an organization is looking to become more Aristotelean it will also look to implementing compensation package that values

individual contributions as well as rewarding its employees based on overall organizational success. Compensation systems are broken down into base pay and variable pay. Base pay being the guaranteed wage/salary an employee makes for showing up and doing what is required. Variable pay is pay based on individual and/or organizational success (Mello, 2011). Strategies such as bonuses, gain sharing and profit sharing are all designed to provide employees with financial gains resulting from their own ideas and efforts. Bonuses incentivize exceptional performance by offering a one-time fixed payment for achievement of predetermined goal in excess of standard requirements. Gain sharing is a variable pay strategy which offers employees the opportunity to make additional income from their ideas/efforts to improve profitability. If an employee comes up with an idea or suggestion that enables the organization to reduce loss or increase profit, the employee is offered a portion of the gain as a reward. The company literally shares in the gain realized from the employee's idea. Profit sharing is similar to gain sharing but is an enterprise-wide program. The organization agrees to share with employees a predetermined percentage of corporate profits. The idea is that employees will benefit financially when the organization benefits financially. Additional policies like offering a bonus for employee suggestions leading to positive results not easily quantified can also be utilized to allow employees to share in the fruits of their labor/ideas. Leadership development is another essential element of an Aristotelean organization. Companies with well-developed organizational development (OD) programs are focused on creating great leaders. One important element necessary for proper leadership development is a decentralized decision-making process. If decision-making capabilities are centralized at the top of the organization, the opportunity for lower level managers to develop fully will be limited. Concentrated power stymies creative innovations from others as well as limiting the intellectual horsepower of the organization to one

person. Leaders at all levels should be analyzed against competency models to determine if and where skill gaps exist. Plans are then devised to close the skill gaps with training and development. Programs like succession management are designed to create formal contingency plans for key organizational positions, usual executive level. High potential employees are identified as successors and then a plan is created to provide the training and development opportunities necessary to prepare them to assume key roles in the appropriate time frame (Mello, 2011). Strategies for leadership development include job assignments (job rotation), networking opportunities (mentor-mentee relationships) and formal education (training and development).

Aristotelean Workplace

An Aristotelean workplace is designed to be successful economically as well as allow for worker self-fulfillment, learning, and growth. Proponents of an Aristotelean workplace are many, but none better than Peter Drucker. In the late 1970's Drucker advocated what he called the "Zen approach" to employee development in which employees were given opportunity to engage in continuous improvement with the express purpose of self-improvement. Drucker's approach was adopted in Japan and was radically different from the typical Western philosophy which had as its two main purposes acquiring specific skills and promotion. One of the greatest Aristotelean lessons for businesses to learn is that workers desire the intrinsic benefit of learning and do not need paid extra to do something that meets a natural need (O'Toole, 2005).

Distributive justice.

By allowing itself to be informed by the concept of an Aristotelean workplace of distributive justice, human resources will be better positioned to enable the organization to maximize its human capital. Aristotle's concept of distributive justice, the idea that a specific

individual or entity assigns shares according to some design, has great application when applied to how a business relates to its employees. Aristotle's (1999) concept of the golden mean is helpful and instructive when considering how to allocate resources. Aristotle develops the doctrine of the mean in the course of his discussion of *aretê*, excellence or virtue, in Book II of the *Nicomachean Ethics* (see also *Eudemian Ethics*, Book II, chapters 3 and 5). There he writes that,

All excellence makes what has it good, and also enables it to perform its function well.

For instance, the excellence of an eye makes the eye good and enables it to function well as an eye; having good eyes means being able to see well. Likewise, the excellence of a horse makes it a good horse, and so good at galloping, carrying its rider, and facing the enemy. If this is true in all cases, then, the excellence of a human being will be that disposition which makes him a good human being and which enables him to perform his function well. (1106a16-25)

A virtuous organization or CEO working to be Aristotelean needs to take heed of the golden mean as an example of how to avoid the excess of both selfishness and altruism. A virtuous leader should not keep too much for themselves nor should they give away too much to the point the organization does have the resources necessary to operate. Aristotle realizes that the golden mean is different for each person and according to each unique circumstance (NE, 1106a). Aristotle believes that justice is related to equality, hence an unjust act results from an unequal sharing of some good. However, although equality before the law means sameness, equality in the distribution of material rewards means something else. Aristotle provides further insight into how the mean is determined in Book II, chapter 6: "excellence... is a settled disposition determining choice, involving the observance of the mean relative to us, this being

determined by reason, as the practically wise person would determine it' (1106b36-1107a2; cf. EE II.5, 1222a6-10). Remembering that for Aristotle and the ancients, reciprocity is the appropriate method of interaction in the *polis*. That being said, a virtuous person tries to make every effort to make sure every party to a transaction receives a fair share. An Aristotelean distribution of material reward should be based on proportion and equality with each person receiving a return proportionate to their contribution. Injustice would lie at the extremes (O'Toole, 2005, p. 252). The idea of proportionality of rewards is one that organizations can and should use to review and analyze their compensation packages, especially when it comes to executive compensation. Although Aristotle does not give us explicit directions for the distribution of created wealth, O'Toole (2005) offers a series of questions Aristotelean managers need to ask themselves: Am I taking more in my share of rewards than my contributions warrant?, Does the distribution of goods in the organization preserve the happiness of the community?, Would everyone in the organization enter in the employment contract under the current terms if they truly had other choices?, and Would we come to a different principle of allocation if all of the parties concerned were represented at the table? The hard fast rule of distributive justice is that fairness is most likely to come out of a process of rational and moral deliberation among friends and equals (pp. 260-261).

Managers must make decisions on how to allot jobs, promotions, raises, perks, privileges, etc. and differentiate employees pay rates across the company. The key issue in distributive justice is determining what constitutes merit. In *Politics* (1980) Aristotle uses the example of how one ought to decide which pipe players receive which flute and comes to the conclusion that the best players should receive the best flutes, lest the best flutes go to waste on players that cannot use it to its potential. Applying this logic to business, human resource decisions can be

made based on an assessment of which individual will make the “greatest contribution” to the business. Understanding that for Aristotle the “greatest contribution” does not mean greatest profit contribution, as he sees money as a means to the good life and not a desirable or appropriate end. Aristotelian business ethics enjoins managers to allocate rewards not merely based on profit maximization, but with an eye to reward virtuous conduct. Thinking beyond profits does not mean that businesses should reward someone undeserving, rather it means that managers should reward the person who is productive and virtuous (Bragues, 2006, pp. 351-352). Although Aristotle does not dwell much on the thorny technical problems of the issue, such as questions of the just measure and proportion of taxation, he makes clear that he means to facilitate fairness in opportunity through distributing and redistributing goods to those who have the most talent to use them (Aristotle, 1986, 1282b, 35-1283a, 2).

Distributism.

The Catholic social movement of Distributism is Aristotelean at its core and provides some additional texture to the discussion of the application of distributive justice to contemporary social issues including how a business manages its assets, including human ones. A complete examination of Distributism is far too vast to address here, however, a review of its main tenants is in order. Arthur J. Penty penned *Distributism: A Manifesto* in 1937 as a way to state the main beliefs of the tradition and provide an easily read and understood document. He lays bare the main economic principals of property, machinery, money, guilds, the state, agriculture and self-sufficiency, and the fiscal question. In the opinion of Distributionists, opposed to Socialism and Communism, private property in is necessary for economic freedom, initiative and for a sense of personal responsibility. The problem is the maldistribution of property which came about as a result of laws favoring large ownership at the expense of small.

The use of machinery should be restricted as it impedes the widespread distribution of property and also where it conflicts with permanent interests of life (Penty, 1937/2004) meaning that the extensive use of machinery has degraded man's manual dexterity and therefore undermines his independence and self-respect. While machinery was initially justified by the claim that it raised the standard of living by reducing the costs and selling prices, in the *Distributists Manifesto* Penty (1937/2004) asserted that it had come to do nothing more than raise prices by intensifying competition thus adding to selling costs thereby adding to the costs of living. Unrestricted, machinery for distributionists will become an instrument of power rather than wealth, resulting in it ultimately having a disintegrating effect on the social fabric. Money's only legitimate use according to Penty (1937/2004) is as a common measure of value. The problem with money arises as people do not use it as a common measure of value and instead try to make more money. The correlation with Aristotle's position on wealth seeking is very direct (Aristotle, 1986, 1258a, 38-1258b, 2, Aristotle, 1985, 1096a, 6). Distributionists advocate regulative Guilds as the natural agencies for the control of money and machinery. Guilds would serve to enforce standards, moral conduct, and workmanship, over industry thus wresting control out of the hands of the financier and place it back in the hands of the craftsman and technician. Distributionists believe in a perfect society people are held together by personal and human ties but acknowledge there is no perfect society because there is always a portion of people who pursue their own selfish ends. The State is necessary to keep selfish people in subjection and to protect the community from men of prey (Penty, 1937/2004) so that justice and order can be maintained. Although a proponent of limited State power, distributionists are against the Totalitarian State in favor of a plurality of powers which preserves liberty by ensuring the excess of one power are corrected by the others. The foundation of a healthy and stable society rests on a foundation of

agriculture and home-produced raw materials with commerce based in native manufacturers.

Distributionists believe that all national prosperity rests upon agriculture and that alienation from the physical demands of working the land will lead to rapid decline in physical fortitude. The fiscal question of free trade versus protection follows closely the issue of agriculture.

Distributionists are opposed to free trade in favor of local producers and protectionism. Sagar (1946/2008) provides a summary of Distributionist theory as wanting to distribute control as widely as possible by means of direct family ownership of land and capital which requires cooperation between personal owners. Belloc (2007) in his 1912 book *The Servile State* points out the two important tenets of the capitalist state, “that the citizens thereof are politically free; i.e. can use or withhold at will their possessions or their labor, but are also divided into capitalist and proletarian in such proportions that the State as a whole is not characterized by the institution of ownership among free citizens, but the restriction of ownership to a section markedly less than the whole, or even to a small minority (p. 25). Belloc’s (2007) position is that society is moving toward, and already beginning to become, a servile state in which man is reduced to a slave-like state, dispossessed of the means of production and working for the advantage of others. His solution is the widespread distribution of land and capital in alignment with Distributionist theory.

The connection between Distributism and Aristotelean business practices comes mostly in the areas of property and guilds, as these deal directly with people. The idea of property being an essential element of society comports with modern business practices, based in capitalism. Businesses operate in a society where private ownership is not only permitted, but also encouraged and protected by law. Aristotelean businesses utilize the concept of distributive justice to determine resource allocation. Implicit in distributive justice is the idea that all

members of the *polis* [organizations] add value and therefore deserve a proportional allocation of material rewards. As businesses decide an appropriate value of each individual's contribution (HR calls this the process of job evaluation), they make decisions pertaining to pay levels. The practice of setting compensation levels consistent and proportional with value creation is in perfect alignment with Aristotle's idea of distributive justice. Aristotle makes it clear that there is a minimum degree of wealth a person needs in order to function (Aristotle, 1986, 1258a, 38-1258b, 2) when he talks about the honorable pursuit of wealth as a means to run a household. Businesses go to great lengths to insure compliance with federal (Fair Labor Standards Act) as well as state-specific laws regarding minimum wage. When considering Guilds today, one needs to look at labor unions and professions. Labor unions serve as a means for employees to collectively bargain with employers over the terms and conditions of employment (Mello, 2011). Unions serve as the collective conscious of the workforce and set for themselves standards of conduct and production, thus taking some of the control out of the hands of management. Labor unions function to work on behalf of its members to ensure a more equitable distribution of material rewards in the form of higher pay, better benefits and additional security that would otherwise be unavailable. Unions propose to offer their members a change to level the playing field by shifting the power dynamic back in favor of the worker. Fritz (2013) offers a definition of the professions which I will adopt: "Today, the professions represent a wide variety of occupations engaged in specialized and/or knowledge work in a service economy" (p. 4). Referencing Kimball (1995), Fritz (2013) goes on to discuss two enduring features professions have possessed across time and throughout their evolution: an expectation of relative autonomy and an expectation of adherence to ethic norms (p. 5). Professions not only provide for their members an ethical moor which governs behavior, but also serve to set expectations for

organizations in the area of compensation. Professional networks and associations are similar to unions in that they are designed to empower workers with additional bargaining strength against organizations. They differ from unions in that professions, because of their highly valuable skill sets, provide members with legitimacy which correlates to a higher value assessment resulting in better earnings.

The connection between Aristotle's notion of distributive justice and the Catholic social movement of Distributism is strong and one that deserves more research and scholarly examination than afforded to it in this project. The similarities are stark and could provide ample fodder for additional consideration.

This final chapter rounded out my research into the implications of an Aristotelean perspective on management, specifically human resource management. Moving from theory to praxis has given me the chance to walk the humanities into the market place by offering practical advice on how to reimagine human resource management in light of ancient philosophy.

Summary and Conclusion

In the preceding pages I have explored Aristotle's concept of *eudaimonia*, or the good life, as a means to inform organizational communication in order to reimagine human resource management. Chapter 1 served to lay bare the current paradigm of egoism/altruism as the inappropriately accepted method to interpret employer/employee relationships. Google was used as an example of a successful contemporary organization widely criticized for their profitability and exploitation of workers. A historical example, Robert Owen, of the 19th century social utopians was used to illustrate a successful enterprise widely lauded for their altruism and benevolence. By juxtaposing these two examples it became easy to illustrate that if one judged Google by the criteria applied to Robert Owen and Robert Owen by the criteria applied to

Google, that praise or blame is dependent solely on the bias of the critic. History's critics have taken a position on Google and Owen, based primarily on the bias of the times, most notably a Hobbesian view of man and Marxist view of capitalism. The Hobbesian bifurcation of winners and losers, also espoused by Marx, is historically and philosophically problematic. In chapter 2 a paradigm of reciprocity, drawing upon Alastair McIntyre's critique of the egoism/altruism dichotomy and Aristotle's understanding of the *polis*, is offered as an alternative to the modern, Hobbesian paradigm shown lacking. The Hobbesian paradigm in which relationships are essentially a competition with incompatible self-interests leading to a winner and a loser is an inaccurate, albeit a traditionally accepted philosophical underpinning for social critique. The unexamined assumption of the validity of the egoism/altruism dichotomy has led to an inherent bias on the part of the critics, and therefore needs to be replaced with the Aristotelian concept of reciprocity as the dominant paradigm for interactions between individuals. Chapter 3 discussed Aristotle's concept of *eudaimonia* as well as organizational communication, specifically those done internally to create a culture or brand. The concepts of culture and branding are explored and dealt with in depth. This final chapter entailed a discussion of the evolution of human resources, how HR and culture are connected, and ended with a look at what HR according to Aristotle should look like, including a discussion of ethics and distributism.

The intent of this project was to look to Aristotle to inform organizational communication practices and reimagine the practice of human resource management. Using the historical example of the Social Utopians compared to the contemporary example of Google, the issue of bias was identified grounded in the improperly accepted Hobbesian paradigm of winners and losers as well as the Marxian perspective of capitalism. Ultimately the main problem identified is acceptance of the ego/altruism dichotomy. Having proved the historically accepted paradigm

Eudaimonia: Using Aristotle to Inform Organizational Communication in Order to Reimagine Human Resource Management

of interactions between individuals to be improper, reciprocity is offered as a philosophical alternative. In order to truly understand the traditional historical perspective, an exploration of Hobbes and Marx followed, bolstered by insight from McIntyre on ego/altruism and Aristotle on the polis. Buber helps to establish reciprocity as the proper paradigm. Having established the new paradigm and grounded ourselves in Aristotle, an examination of the concept of *eudaimonia* and its various possible meanings help set the stage for my assertion that organizations should adopt an Aristotelean perspective on human resource management, anchored in the idea that organizational communication, specifically internal branding done to create culture, can help position themselves as an integral part of their employees' achieving *eudaimonia*. A significant discussion of organizational culture and internal organizational communication emphasized the importance of organizational branding for creating eudaimonian feelings in employees. Additional strategies are gleaned from the disciplines of professional civility and positive organizing. The final phase of the project moves into a look at how Aristotelean philosophies can and should inform the practice of human resource management in business. The evolution of HR, from staffing to personnel to human resources is discussed in order to connect it to organizational culture. Through an analysis of the concept of money and a look at wealth seeking, connections to an Aristotelean perspective are made evident. Looking to Aristotle again, his concept of the golden mean provides a reference point as distributive justice is explored. Ending with the Catholic social movement of Distributism, additional recommendations for an Aristotelean workplace are made.

References

- Ackrill, J. L. (1980). Aristotle on Eudaimonia. In Rorty, A. O. (Ed.), *Essays on Aristotle's Ethics* (pp. 7-14). Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- Allan, D.J. (1952). *The Philosophy of Aristotle*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Aquinas, T. (1964). *Commentary on Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics* (C.J. Litzinger, Trans.). Notre Dame, IN: Dumb Ox Books.
- Aristotle. (1980). *The politics of Aristotle* (E. Barker, Trans.). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Aristotle (1981). Eudemian Ethics. Aristotle in 23 Volumes, Vol. 20. (H. Rackham & W. Heinemann, Trans). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Aristotle. (1984). *The rhetoric and the poetics of Aristotle*. (W. Rhys Roberts, & I. Bywater, Trans.). New York, NY: Random House.
- Aristotle. (1986). *The politics* (W. Ellis, Trans.). New York, NY: Prometheus Books.
- Aristotle. (1999). *Nicomachean ethics* (2nd ed., T. Irwin, Trans.). Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing, Inc.
- Aristotle. (2004). *On the Soul and Memory and Recollection* (Joe Sachs, Trans.). Santa Fe, NM: Green Lion Press.
- Arnett, R.C. (1986). *Communication and Community: Implications of Martin Buber's dialogue*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Arnett, R.C., Fritz, J.H., & Bell, L.M. (2009). *Communication Ethics Literacy: Dialogue and Difference*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ashcraft, K., Kuhn, T.R. & Cooren, F. (2009). Constitutional Amendments: "Materializing" Organizational Communication. *Academy of Management Annals*, 3(1), 1-64.
- Bakker, A. (2013). *Advances in Positive Organization: Advances in Positive Organizational Psychology*. Bradford, GB: Emerald Group Publishing Limited. Retrieved from <http://www.ebrary.com>
- Barney, J. B. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17, 99-120.
- Becker, H.P. (1956). *Man in Reciprocity*. New York, NY: Praeger.
- Beinhocker, E.D. (2006). *The Origin of Wealth: The Radical Remaking of Economics and What it Means for Business and Society*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Belloc, H. (2007). *The Servile State*. Middletown, DE: Cosimo Classics.
- Bowie, N. (1991). Challenging the Egoism Paradigm. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 1(1), 1-21.
- Bragues, G. (2006). Seek the good life, not money: the Aristotelian approach to business. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 67(4), 341-357.
- Bright, D., Cameron, K. & Caza, A. (2006). The Amplifying and Buffering Effects of Virtuousness in Downsizing Organizations. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 64(3), 249-269.
- Buber, M. (1970). *I and Thou* (W. Kaufmann, Trans.). New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Buchholz, T. (2007). *New Ideas from Dead Economists*. London, England: Plume.
- Buzzanell, P., Stohl, C. (1999) The Redding Tradition of Organizational Communication Scholarship: W. Charles Redding and His Legacy. *Communication Studies*, 50, 324-336.
- Calkins, T. (2005). The challenge of branding. In A. M. Tybout, & T. Calkins (Eds.), *Kellogg on branding: The marketing faculty of the Kellogg School of Management* (pp. 1-8). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

- Cameron K. (2013). Advances in Positive Organizational Scholarship. In A. Bakker (Ed.), *Advances in Positive Organization: Advances in Positive Organizational Psychology*. Bradford, GB: Emerald Group Publishing Limited. Retrieved from <http://www.ebrary.com>
- Cameron, K., Bright, D., & Caza, A. (2004). Exploring the relationships between organizational virtuousness and performance. *American Behavioural Scientist*, 47(6), 1–24.
- Cappelli, P. (2000). Market-mediated employment: The historical context. In Blair, M. M. & Kochan, T. A. (Eds.), *The New Relationship: Human Capital in the American Corporation* (pp. 66-101). Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institute.
- Cheshkov, Marat A. (1993). Will The Marxist Theory Of Exploitation Survive? *Problems Of Economic Transition*, 36(6), 59.
- Cole, G.D.H. (1930). *The Life of Robert Owen*. London, UK: Macmillan.
- Collins, D. (1987). Aristotle and Business. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 6, 567-572.
- Cooper, J. (1986). *Reason and Human Good in Aristotle*. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing Company.
- Cooren, F. (2004). The Communicative Achievement of Collective Minding; Analysis of Board Meetings Excerpts. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 17, 517-551.
- Corman, S.R. & Poole, M.S. (2000) *Perspectives on Organizational Communication: Finding Common Ground*, New York, NY: Guiliford Press.
- Cullinane, N. & Dundon, T. (2006). The Psychological Contract: A Critical Review. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 8(2), 113-129.
- Deckop, J., Cirka, C. & Anderson, L. (2003). Doing Unto Others: The Reciprocity of Helping Behavior in Organizations. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 47(2), 101-113.
- Dierksmeier, C. & Pirson, M. (2009). Oikonomia and Chrematistike: Learning from Aristotle About the Future of Management. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 88(3).
- Donnachie, I. (2000). *Robert Owen: Owen of New Lanark and New Harmony*. Edinburgh: Tuckwell Press.
- Douglas, M., & Isherwood, B. (1996). *The world of goods: Towards an Anthropology of consumption*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Durand, R. & Lambert, Z. (1985). Alienation and Criticisms of Advertising. *Journal of Advertising*, 14(3), 9-17.
- Dyck, B. and R. Kleysen (2001). Aristotle's Virtues and Management Thought: An Empirical Exploration of an Integrative Pedagogy. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 11(4), 561-574.
- Eisenburg, E. & Riley, P. (2001). Organizational Culture. In F. Jablin & L. Putnam (Eds.), *The New Handbook of Organizational Communication: Advances in Theory, Research, and Methods* (pp. 291-322). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Emerson, R.M. (1981). Social Exchange Theory. In M. Rosenberg & R.H Turner (Eds.), *Social Psychology: Perspective*. New York, NY: Houghton-Mifflin.
- Engels, F. (2012). *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific* (Paul Larfarque, Trans.). Chicago, IL: Echo Library.
- Fisher, W. R. (1989). *Human communication as narration: Toward a philosophy of reason, value, and action*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press.
- Florea, L., Cheung, Y. H., & Herndon, N. C. (2013). For all good reasons: Role of values in organizational sustainability. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 114(3), 393-408.
- Fredrickson, B. & Dutton, J. (2008). Unpacking positive organizing: Organizations as sites of individual and group flourishing. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 3(1), 1-3.

Eudaimonia: Using Aristotle to Inform Organizational Communication in Order to Reimagine Human Resource Management

- Friedman, M. (1955). *Martin Buber: The Life of Dialogue*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Fritz, J.M. H. (2013). *Professional Civility: Communicative Virtue Ethics*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Fritz, J.M.H. & Omdahl, B.L. (Eds.). (2006). *Problematic Relationships in the Workplace*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Glasgow, W.D. (1978). Broad on Psychological Egoism. *Ethics*, 88(4), 361-368.
- Gobe', M. (2009). *Emotional Branding: The New Paradigm for Connecting Brands to People*. New York, NY: Allworth Press.
- Godwin, W. (1793), *Political Justice, Vol. I*. London.
- Gong, Y., Law, K. S., Chang, S., & Xin, K. R. (2009). Human resource management and firm performance: The differential role of managerial affective and continuance commitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(1), 263-275.
- Gorb, P. (1951). Robert Owen as a Businessman. *Bulletin of the Business Historical Society*, 25(3), 127-148.
- Gouldner, A.W. (1960). The Norm of Reciprocity: A Preliminary Statement. *American Sociological Review*, 25, 161-178.
- Grant, A.M. & Schwartz, B. (2011). Too Much of a Good Thing: The Challenges an Opportunity of an Inverted-U. *Perspectives in Psychological Science*, 6, 61-76.
- Groom, S. (2008) Integrated Marketing Communication. *Communication Research Trends*, 27(4), 3-19.
- Gubman, E. (2004). HR Strategy and Planning: From Birth to Business Results. *HR. Human Resource Planning*, 27(1), 13-23.
- Hansell, S. (2007, January 3). Google Answer to Filling Jobs is an Algorithm. *New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com>
- Hardie, W.F.R. (1967). The Final Good in Aristotle's Ethics. In J.M.E. Moravcsik (Ed.), *Aristotle: A Collection of Critical Essays* (pp. 297-322). Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Harre', R. (1986). An outline of the social constructionist viewpoint. In R. Harre' (Ed.), *The social construction of emotions* (pp. 2-14). New York, NY: Basil Blackwell.
- Harrison, J.F.C. (1969). *Robert Owen and the Owenites in Britain and America: The Quest for the New Moral World*. London, UK: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Hatcher, T. (2013). Robert Owen: a historiographic study of a pioneer of human resource development. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 37(4), 414-431.
- Heidegger, M. (1962). *Being and Time*. New York, NY: Harper-Collins Publishers.
- Heilbroner, R. (1999). *The Worldly Philosophers: The Lives, Times and Ideas of the Great Economic Thinkers*. New York, NY: Touchstone.
- Hillefarb, G. (1996). *The De-Moralization of Society; From Victorian Virtues to Modern Values*. New York, NY: Vintage.
- Hobbes, T. (1841). *Philosophical Rudiments Concerning Government and Society*. In W. Molesworth (Ed.), *English Works of Hobbes* (Vol II). London, UK: J. Bohn Publisher. (Original work published 1651)
- Hobbes, T. (1994). *Leviathan* (E. Curley, Ed.). Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc.
- Hobhouse, L.T. (1906). *Morals in Evolution: A Study in Comparative Ethics*. London, UK: Chapman and Hall.

Eudaimonia: Using Aristotle to Inform Organizational Communication in Order to Reimagine Human Resource Management

- Hoffman, M. & Ford, D. (2010). *Organizational Rhetoric: Situations and Strategies*. London, UK: Sage.
- Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G.J. & Minkov, M. (2010). *Cultures in Organizations: Software of the Mind: Intercultural Cooperation and Its Importance for Survival* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: McGrawHill.
- Holloway, M. (1966). *Utopian Communities in America, 1680-1880*. New York, NY: Dover Publications.
- Holt, D. (2002). Why Do Brands Cause Trouble? A Dialectical Theory of Consumer Culture and Branding. *The Journal of Consumer Research*, 29(1), 70-90.
- Hume, D. (1999). *An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding* (T. L. Beauchamp, Ed.). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Ind, N. (2006). Beyond Branding: From Abstraction to Cubism. *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 15(2), 148-149.
- Jablin, F., Putnam, L. (2001) *The New Handbook of Organizational Communication: Advances in Theory, Research, and Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Jamrog, J. J., & Overholt, M. H. (2004). Building a Strategic HR Function: Continuing the Evolution. *HR. Human Resource Planning*, 27(1), 51-62.
- Jordan, A. & Meara, N. (1990). Ethics and the Professional Practice of Psychologists: The Role of Virtues and Principles. *Professional Psychology Research and Practice*, 21, 107-114.
- Kant, I. (1998). *A Critique of Pure Reason* (P. Guyer & A. Wood, Trans.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Kapeliushnikov, R. I. (1993). Exploitation: A Term with a Variable Meaning. *Problems of Economic Transition*, 36(6), 27.
- Kierkegaard, S. (1985). *Fear and trembling* (A. Hannay Trans.). New York, NY: Penguin Books.
- Kramer, M. (2010). *Organizational Socialization: Joining and Leaving Organizations*. Malden, MA: Polity.
- Kraut, R. (1989). *Aristotle on the Human Good*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Kraut, R. (Ed.). (2006). *The Blackwell Guide to Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.
- Lawler, E.E. & Mohrman, S. (2003). HR as a strategic partner: What does it take to make it happen? *Human Resource Planning*, 26(5), 15.
- Lear, G.R. (2004). *Happy Lives and The Highest Good: An Essay on Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Lear, G.R. (2006). Aristotle on Moral Virtue and the Fine. In R. Kraut (Ed.), *The Blackwell Guide to Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics* (pp. 116-136). Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.
- Lerner, A. (1972). A Note on 'Understanding the Marxian Notion of Exploitation'. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 10(1), 50.
- Levy, S. (2011). *In the Plex: How Google thinks, works, and shapes our lives*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Losey, M. (1998). HR comes of age. *HR Magazine*, 43(3), 40-53.
- Lowry, S.T. (1987). *The archeology of economic idea: The classical Greek tradition*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Eudaimonia: Using Aristotle to Inform Organizational Communication in Order to Reimagine Human Resource Management

- Lutgen-Sandvik, P., Riforgiate, S. & Fletcher, C. (2011). Work as a Source of Positive Emotional Experiences and the Discourses Informing Positive Assessment. *Western Journal of Communication*, 75(1), 2-27.
- Mackay, A.F. (2005). Aristotle's Dilemma. *The Journal of Ethics*, 9(3/4), 533-549.
- Macpherson, C.B. (1945). Hobbes Today. *The Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science*, 11(4), 524-534.
- Manjoo, F. (2013). The Happiness Machine: How Google became such a great place to work. *Slate*. Retrieved from <http://www.slate.com>
- Martin, J. (1992). *Cultures in Organizations: Three Perspectives*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Marx, K. (1904). *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* (N.I. Stone, Trans). Chicago, IL: Charles H. Kerr & Company.
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). A Theory of Human Motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50(4), 370-396.
- May, S & Mumby, D.K. (2005). *Engaging Organizational Communication Theory and Research: Multiple Perspectives*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications
- Mayo, E. (1930). The Human Effect of Mechanization. *The American Economic Review*, 20(1), 156-176.
- Meikle, S. (1995). *Aristotle's economic thought*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- MacIntyre, A. (1967). Egoism and altruism. In Paul Edwards (Ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- MacIntyre, A. (1999). *Dependent Rational Animals: Why Human Beings Need the Virtues*. Chicago, IL: Open Court.
- MacIntyre, A. (2007). *After Virtue* (3rd ed.). Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- McNeill, D. (1990). Alternative Interpretations of Aristotle on Exchange and Reciprocity. *Public Affairs Quarterly*, 4(1), 55-68.
- Mello, J.A. (2011). *Strategic Human Resource Management* (3rd ed.). Mason, OH: Cengage Learning.
- Moch, M.K. & Fields, W.C. (1985). Developing a Content Analysis for Interpreting Language Use in Organizations. In S.B. Bacharach (Ed.), *Research in the Sociology of Organizations* (4th ed., pp. 81-126). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Molm, L. (2010). The Structure of Reciprocity. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 73(2), 119-131.
- Molm, L. & Cook, K. (1995). Social Exchange and Exchange Networks. In K. Cook, G.A. Fine & J.S. House (Eds.), *Sociological Perspectives on Social Psychology*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Molm, L., Collett, L. & Schaefer, D. (2007). Building Solidarity through Generalized Exchange: A Theory of Reciprocity. *American Journal of Sociology*, 113(1), 205-242.
- Molm, L, Schaefer, D. & Collett, J. (2007). The Value of Reciprocity. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 70(2), 199-217.
- Moravcsik, J.M.E. (Ed.). (1967). *Aristotle: A Collection of Critical Essays*. New York, NY: Anchor Books.
- Morris, T. (1997). *If Aristotle ran General Motors: The new soul of business*. New York, NY: Henry Holt and Company, Inc.
- Nagel, T. (1980). Aristotle on Eudaimonia. In Rorty, A. O. (Ed.), *Essays on Aristotle's Ethics* (pp. 7-14). Oakland, CA: University of California Press.
- Nietzsche, F. (1924). *The Joyful Wisdom* (T. Common Trans.). New York, NY: The McMillan Company.

Eudaimonia: Using Aristotle to Inform Organizational Communication in Order to Reimagine Human Resource Management

- Nowak, M.A. & Sigmund, K. (2000). Shrewd Investments. *Science*, 288, 819-820.
- Nussbaum, M. (1990). *Love's Knowledge: Essays on Philosophy and Literature*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Oakley, J., & Cocking, D. (2001). *Virtue Ethics and Professional Roles*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Ogilvie, J. R., & Stork, D. (2003). Starting the HR and Change Conversation with History. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 16(3), 254-271.
- O'Toole, J. (2005). *Creating the Good Life: Applying Aristotle's Wisdom to Find Meaning and Happiness*. San Francisco, CA: Rodale Publishers.
- Owen, R. (1813). *A New View of Society: Or, Essays on the Principle of the Formation of Human Character*, 2nd edition. London.
- Park, N. & Peterson C.M. (2003). Virtues and Organizations. In K.S. Cameron, J.E. Dutton & R.E. Quinn (Eds.), *Positive Organizational Scholarship: Foundations of a New Discipline* (pp. 33-47). San Francisco, CA: Berrett Koehler.
- Parkinson, B. (1996). Emotions are social. *British Journal of Psychology*, 87, 663-683.
- Paxton, P. (1999). Is Social Capital Declining in the United States? A Multiple Indicator Assessment. *American Journal of Sociology*, 105, 88-127.
- Penty, A.J. (2004). *Distributism: A Manifesto*. In John Sharp (Ed.), *Distributist Perspectives* (Vol. I, pp. 86-110). Norfolk, VA: IHS Press. (Original work published 1937)
- Pellegrino, E.D. (1995). Toward a Virtue-Based Normative Ethics for the Health Professions. *Kennedy Institute of Ethics Journal*, 5, 253-277.
- Penaloza, L. & Venkatesh, A. (2008). Further evolving the new dominant logic of marketing: From services to the social construction of markets. *Marketing Theory*, 6(3), 299-316
- Podmore, F. (1905). Robert Owen and Cooperation. *The Economic Journal*, 15(58), 257-265.
- Podmore, F. (1907). *Robert Owen: A Biography*. New York, NY: Haskell House.
- Postman, N. (1992). *Technopoly: The surrender of culture to technology*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Pozner, B. Z., Kouzes, J. M., & Schmidt, W. H. (1985). Shared values make a difference: An empirical test of corporate culture. *Human Resource Management*, 24(3), 293-309.
- Randall, J.H. (1962). *Aristotle*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Raphael, D.D. (1985). *Adam Smith*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press
- Raphael, D.D. (2007). *The Impartial Spectator: Adam Smith's Moral Philosophy*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Reeve, C.D.C. (1992). *Practices of Reason: Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics*. Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Reeve, C.D.C. (2012). *Action, Contemplation and Happiness: An Essay on Aristotle*. London, UK: Harvard University Press.
- Rorty, A. O. (Ed.). (1980). *Essays on Aristotle's Ethics*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- Ruiz-palomino, P., Martínez-cañas, R., & Fontrodona, J. (2013). Ethical culture and employee outcomes: The mediating role of person-organization fit. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 116(1), 173-188.
- Rushkoff, D. (2016). *Throwing Rocks at the Google Bus: How Growth Became the Enemy of Prosperity*. New York, NY: Portfolio/Penguin.
- Sagar, S. (2008). *Distributism*. In John Sharpe (Ed.), *Distributist Perspectives* (Vol. II, pp. 87-107). Norfolk, VA: IHS Press. (Original work published 1946)

- Sandoe, P. (1999). Quality of Life: Three Competing Views. *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice*, 2(1), 11-23.
- Sathe, V. (1983, Autumn). Implications of Corporate Culture: A Manager's Guide to Action. *Organizational Dynamics*, 5-23.
- Schein, E. (1990). Organizational Culture. *American Psychologist*, 45(2), 109-119.
- Schein, E. (1991). What is culture. In P. Frost, L. Moore, M. Reis Louis, C. Lundberg & J. Martin (Eds.), *Reframing Organizational Culture* (pp. 243-253). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Schilpp, P. A., & Friedman, M. (Eds.). (1967). *The philosophy of Martin Buber*. London, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Schultz, D. E., & Schultz, H. (2003). *IMC, the next generation: Five steps for delivering value and measuring returns using marketing communication*. New York, NY: The McGraw-Hill Companies.
- Shiffman, D. (2008). *The age of engage: Reinventing marketing for today's connected, collaborative, and hyperactive culture*. Ladera Ranch, CA: Hunt Street Press.
- Shore, L. M. & Tetrick, L. (1994). The Psychological Contract as an explanatory Framework in the Employment Relationship. In C.L. Cooper & D.M. Rousseau (Eds.), *Trends in Organizational Behavior* (Vol. 1, pp. 91-109). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Simmel, G. (1950). *The Sociology of Georg Simmel* (K. Wolff, Ed. & Trans.). Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Skidelsky, R. & Skidelsky, E. (2012). *How Much is Enough: Money and the Good Life*. New York, NY: Other Press.
- Smircich, L. (1983). Concepts of Culture and Organizational Analysis. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 28, 339-358.
- Solomon, R. C. (2004). Aristotle, Ethics and Business Organizations. *Organization Studies*, 25(6), 1021-1043.
- Stead, G. (2004). Culture and Career Psychology: A Social Constructionist Perspective. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 64, 389-406.
- Stirner, M. (1974). *The ego and his own*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Stobart, P. (1994). *Brand Power*. New York, NY: NYU Press.
- Sullivan, J. (2013, February 13). How Google Became the #3 Most Valuable Firm by Using People Analytics to Reinvent HR. *ERE Media*. Retrieved from <http://ere.net>
- Tatransky, T. (2008). A Reciprocal Asymmetry? Levinas's Ethics Reconsidered. *Ethical Perspectives*, 15(3), 293-307.
- Taylor, F.W. (1911). *Principals of Scientific Management*. New York, NY: Harper & Brothers Publishers.
- Taylor, J.R. (1993). *Rethinking the Theory of Organizational Communication: How to Read an Organization*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Taylor, A. (1995). New views of an old moral world: an appraisal of Robert Owen. *Labor History*, 36(1), 88-94.
- Taylor, J., Flanagan, A., Cheney, G., Seibold, D. (2001). Organizational Communication Research; Key Moments, Central Concerns, and Future Challenges. *Communication Yearbook*, 24, 99-137.
- Thompson, M. (1969). Making of the English working class. In A.L. Morton (Ed.), *The English Utopia* (pp. 169-182). London, UK: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Tessitore, A. (1992). Aristotle's Ambiguous Account of the Good Life. *Polity*, 25(2), 197-215.

Eudaimonia: Using Aristotle to Inform Organizational Communication in Order to Reimagine Human Resource Management

- Travis, D. (2000). *Emotional branding: How successful brands gain the irrational edge*. Roseville, CA: Prima Venture.
- Thames, R. (1999). *Persuasion's Domain: An Introduction to Rhetoric and Human Affairs*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.
- Thames, R. (2010). *Political Economy*. In Ronald Jackson (Ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Identity* (Vol. 2, pp. 584-587). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Tuck, R. (1989). *Hobbes: A Very Introduction*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Ulrich, D. (1997). *Human Resource Champions*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Valentino, C. M., Porta, J. J., & Nelson, R. H. (2013). A Review of the Pivotal Role of HR in Business Management from the 1980s to the Present. *Employment Relations Today*, 40(1), 33-41.
- Vogel, M. (1970). The concept of responsibility in the thought of Martin Buber. *The Harvard Theological Review*, 63(2), 159-182.
- Vosburgh, R. M. (2007). The Evolution of HR: Developing HR as an Internal Consulting Organization. *HR. Human Resource Planning*, 30(3), 11-16, 18-23.
- Weber, M. (1947) *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Weick, K.E. (1975). Educational Organizations as Loosely Coupled Systems. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 21, 1-19.
- Weick, K.E. (1995). *Sensemaking in Organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Wijnberg, N. M. (2000). Normative Stakeholder Theory and Aristotle: The Link Between Ethics and Politics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 25, 329-342.
- Wright, R. (2000). *Non Zero: The Logic of Human Destiny*. New York, NY: Pantheon Books.
- Wright, P., McMahan, G., & McWilliams, A. (1994). Human resource and sustained competitive advantage: A resource-based perspective. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 2, 301-326.
- Wright, P. M., Dunford, B. B., & Snell, S. A. (2001). Human resources and the resource-based view of the firm. *Journal of Management*, 27, 701-721.
- Wodehouse, H. (1945). Martin Buber's 'I and thou'. *Philosophy*, 20(75), 17-30.